

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

CONTENTS

	PAGE
IZARD, T. C.—The Principal Source for Marlowe's 'Tamburlaine,'	411
ROBBINS, E. W.—The Play of Theano,	417
HARRISON, T. P., Sr.—A Note on 'The Tempest': a Sequel,	422
BROOKE, TUCKER.—"Men May Grope 's in Such a Scarre,"	426
RICE, W. G.—A Principal Source of 'The Battle of Alcazar,'	428
HUTTON, JAMES.—Michel Guy de Tours: Some Sources and Literary Methods,	431
DELATTRE, ANDRÉ.—Les Lettres de Voltaire des manuscrits Tronchin,	441
MEYER, HEINRICH.—Johann Salomon Semler's 'Gedanken von Ubereinkommung der Romane mit den Legenden,' Halle 1749,	447
TAYLOR, ARCHER.—Grete's Bad Name,	452
STURTEVANT, A. M.—A Note on the U-Declension in Old Norse,	454
KURRELMAYER, W.—'Heinsche,' F. = 'Seed-Pod,'	456
KURRELMAYER, W.—'Mäusekorb' = 'Mausefalle'(?),	458
EWING, MAJL.—Notes on Nicoll's 'Hand-List for 1800-1850,'	460

REVIEWS:—

ANDERSON, WILDER, SESSIONS, LESCAZE, The Intent of the Artist, ed. A. CENTENO; WILSON, FOERSTER, RANSOM, AUDEN, The Intent of the Critic, ed. D. A. STAUFFER; Fifteen Poets; N. E. MONROE, The Novel and Society. [David Daiches.]	466
C. H. HERFORD, PERCY and EVELYN SIMPSON (eds.), Ben Jonson. Vol. VII. [A. H. Gilbert.]	469
R. W. BATTENHOUSE, Marlowe's "Tamburlaine"; E. G. CLARK, Raleigh and Marlowe; P. B. BARTLETT (ed.), The Poems of George Chapman. [E. A. Strathmann.]	473
MAXWELL, BRIGGS, JOHNSON, and THOMPSON (eds.), Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig. [Leo Kirschbaum.]	477
ALFRED HARRAGE, Shakespeare's Audience. [T. W. Baldwin.]	481
W. A. NELSON and C. J. HILL (eds.), The Complete Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. [J. G. McManaway.]	483
BASIL WILLEY, The Eighteenth Century Background. [A. O. Lovejoy.]	485
C. DE W. THORPE, The Aesthetic Theory of Thomas Hobbes. [Marjorie Nicolson.]	487
A. D. GRAEFF and Others, The Pennsylvania Germans, ed. Ralph Wood. [P. A. Barba.]	489
BRIEF MENTION: H. E. STEARNS, JR., Germany's Military Heroes of the Napoleonic Era in Her Post-War Historical Drama,	492

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

HAZELTON SPENCER

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

C. S. SINGLETON

KEMP MALONE

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNE.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RBS.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

THE CRITICAL WORKS OF JOHN DENNIS

EDITED BY

EDWARD NILES HOOKER

VOLUME II 1711-1729

This volume completes the publication of the entire body of Dennis's literary criticism. For many years scorned and neglected, Dennis has come into his own as the first professional literary critic in England, as the first great protagonist of John Milton, and as the champion of Molière, Corneille, Racine, Shakespeare, Dryden, Etherege, Wycherley, and Congreve. General appreciation of the value of Dennis's work has hitherto been impossible because most of it is rare, costly, and difficult to come at. Only five of his numerous critical writings have been reprinted in our century. Besides the text of the essays, this edition contains a long introduction on the significance of Dennis's contributions to literary theory and criticism, over two hundred pages of Explanatory Notes which outline all of the main movements in Augustan criticism, and a full, workable Index.

Volume I. Pp. xi + 537. Price, \$5.00—Volume II. Pp. cxliv + 588. Price, \$7.50

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, BALTIMORE MARYLAND

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Spitzer

Editors
on the
manuscript
articles
to the
files of
Quo-
3, not
, MP.,
editors
business

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVIII

JUNE, 1943

Number 6

THE PRINCIPAL SOURCE FOR MARLOWE'S *TAMBURLAINE*

There is pretty general agreement among Marlowe scholars that most of the plot in *Tamburlaine*, Part I, derives ultimately from the account of Tamburlaine in Pedro Mexia's *Silva de varia lecion*, a collection of miscellaneous informational essays, first published in Seville in 1543. Mexia's book evidently enjoyed wide and prolonged popularity. It appeared in twenty-six Spanish editions,¹ besides numerous translations in Italian, German, French, Flemish, and English. The original was a relatively small book divided into three parts, but by 1669 the Spanish version had grown to six parts, filling about seven hundred closely printed quarto pages.² The first English version was a sharply abridged one by Thomas Fortescue called *The Forest or Collection of Historyes no lesse profitable than pleasant and necessary doone out of Frenche into English* (1576, first published in 1571). It has been usually assumed that Marlowe used *The Forest* as his principal source for the plot, supplementing it with details drawn from wide reading. Miss Ellis-Fermor³ for that reason reprinted Fortescue's *Tamburlaine* chapter first in her appendix. The Mexia which Fortescue was translating is Claude Gruget's *Diverses Lecons de Pierre Messie*, first printed in 1552. Fortescue's copy of Gruget was probably of the 1561 edition, printed at Lyon, but he appears to have made use of only 67 of Gruget's 156 chapters. He did, however, include Gruget's entire chapter on Tamburlaine: "Du trespuissant Roy, le

¹ Introduction to Margaret L. Mulroney's *Diálogos o Coloquios of Pedro Mejia* (Iowa City, 1930).

² George Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature* (New York, 1889), I, 538.

³ U. M. Ellis-Fermor, *Tamburlaine the Great* (London, 1930), pp. 286-297.

grand Tamburlan: des Royaumes & prouinces qu'il a conquises: & de sa discipline militaire."⁴ His translation is in the main quite close, as a comparison of the opening sentences will reveal.

Fortescue: There hath been among the *Greekes, Romaines*, the people of *Carthage* and others, infinit worthy and famous Capitains, which as they were right valiant and fortunate in war: so were they no lesse fortunate, in that some others by writing cōmended their Chialry to the posteritie for euer. But in our time we haue had one, in no respect inferioure to any of the others, in this one point notwithstanding lesse happy, that no man hath vouchsaued, by his pen in any sorte to commend him to the posteritie following.⁵

Gruget: Il y a eu de fort excellens capitaines entre les Grecz, Romains, Carthaginiens & autres nations, lesquelz comme ilz furent sages & bien fortunez en guerre, aussi furent ilz heureux à auoir des historiens, qui escriuerent amplemēt leurs actes genereux: Mais en nostre temps s'est trouué vn notable homme, que lon pourroit meritoirement egalier à quel que ce soit de tous les autres neantmoins infortuné en ce qu'il ne trouue aucun qui ait descrit ses faitz.⁶

But in at least one incident, which Marlowe used more than once, Fortescue translated inaccurately:

It is written of him, that in all his assaults, of any Castle or Citie, he vsually would hang out to be seen of the enemy, an Ensigne white, for ye space of one ful day, which signified (as was then to all men well knowen) that if those within, would in that daye yeelde them, he then woulde take them to mercy, without any their losse of life or goods. The second day he did to be hanged out another all red, letting them therby again to vnderstand, that if [they] then would yeeld, he onely then woulde execute the Officers, Magistrates, maisters of houtholdes and gouernours, pardoning, and forgivying all others what soeuer. The third day he euer displayed, the third all black, signifying, that he then had shut vp his gates from all compassion & clemency, in such sorte that who soeuer were in that day taken or in any other then following, should assuredly die.⁷

Gruget's passage, which Fortescue was translating, says nothing of "an Ensigne white"; the corresponding words are "vne tente blanche." And when Marlowe tells of this custom, tents are again used.⁸

Again, though he translated Gruget's entire chapter on Tam-

⁴ Part II, Chap. xxvii, pp. 388-399 in the 1561 edition.

⁵ *The Forest* (1576 edition), p. 73r.

⁶ *Les Diverses Lecons* (1561 edition), Part II, Chap. xxvii, p. 388.

⁷ Page 69r.

⁸ iv, i, 50 ff.; v, i, 7 ff.

burlaine, Fortescue omitted an earlier chapter of Gruget's⁹ which contained a brief life of Bajazeth and supplied the information, used by Marlowe,¹⁰ that Tamburlaine made the kneeling Bajazeth's shoulders his footstool or mounting block.

These deviations made it necessary to assume that Marlowe in addition to Fortescue's *Forest* had consulted some other version deriving from Mexia's *Silva*. The fact probably is that Marlowe had no knowledge of *The Forest*. The most probable immediate source of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* plot has been consistently overlooked. It was printed in George Whetstone's *English Myrror*, which was entered in the Stationers' Register on April 29, 1586, and probably published shortly thereafter; the title page bears the date 1586. Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, Part I, was apparently completed and performed for the first time during the winter of 1587/8. Richard Jones, who printed three editions of *Tamburlaine*, was also Whetstone's usual printer. Though he for some reason did not print *The English Myrror*, Jones did, on the back of the title page of Whetstone's *Enemy to Unthriftynesse* (1586), advertise *The English Myrror* as "ready to be printed."

Whetstone, like Fortescue, translated his *Tamburlaine* chapter from Gruget. But instead of "an Ensigne white" Whetstone says "a white tent,"¹¹ just as Marlowe later does. And Whetstone in addition to Gruget's chapter on *Tamburlaine* also translated the earlier passage on Bajazeth which includes the information that *Tamburlaine* used Bajazeth as a mounting block or footstool.¹² Every item of information that Marlowe has been supposed to gain from Fortescue is to be found in Whetstone, plus details which Fortescue omitted.

The English Myrror may have provided Marlowe with the original suggestion that *Tamburlaine* was a worthy subject for a play. Whetstone (following Gruget) seems to regard his information as exploratory, inadequate, and deserving of amplification. His account begins,

Amonge the illustrious Capitaines Romaines, and Grecians, none of all their martiall acts, deserue to be proclaimed with more renown, then the conquest and millitarie disciplines of Tamberlaine: but such was the iniury of his fortune as no worthy writers vndertooke his historye at large.

⁹ Part I, Chap. XIII, especially p. 85.

¹⁰ At the beginning of IV, ii.

¹¹ *The English Myrror*, p. 81.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 72.

And on his next page Whetstone adds, "It is pittie his pollicies and battayles be not largely written, which in these conquestes could not but be famous."

In addition to most of the plot that Marlowe took from any source he could also have found in *The English Myrror* his theme and his central character outlined with considerable clarity. Whetstone says of Tamburlaine: "Notwithstanding the pouertye of his parents: euen from his infancy he had a reaching & an imaginative minde, the strength and comelinesse of his body, aunswered the hautines of his hart." He was dominated by "a ruling desire." "He parted the spoyle continually among his companions, & intertayned them with such faithfulness & loue, as the rumour thereof dayly increased his strength." When the king of Persia sent a captain with a thousand horse to take him, "*Tamberlaine* so behaued him selfe, as he won this captaine to be his cōpanion & assisted with al his strength." He "valiantly behaued him self" ¹³ and displayed "industry and dexterity in armes."

In his armye was neuer found mutine: he was wise, liberall, and rewarded euery souldiour with his desert: there is no remembrance of a greater army then his: his gouernment and order was such, that his campe seemed a goodly City, wherein euery necessary office was found . . . he suffered no theft vnpunished, and as louingly honored, praised, and payed the vertuous and valiant souldiour, which favour ioyned with iustice, made him both feared and loued.

He "wanted neither vallour, pollicye, nor anye aduantage of war." ¹⁴ "He was euer best at ease when he found a stout resistance in his enemy: that his pollicie and prowesse might be the better known." "With diligence beyond expectation, he rayzed a tower leuel with theirs: from whence he battred them in such sort as they were vnable to resist." ¹⁵ When citizens who had at first refused his offer of compassion sent to him

their wiues & children cloathed all in white, hauing Olive branches in their handes . . . *Tamberlaine* in place of compassion caused his squadrons of horsemen to tread them vnder their feete and not to leaue a mothers child aliue, and afterwarde he leuiled the city with the ground.

When his justice was questioned,

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

Tamberlaine (with a countenance fiered with fury) answered: thou supposest that I am a mā, but thou art deceiued, for I am no other then the ire of God, and the destruction of the world. . . . And in truth *Tamberlaine* although he was endued with many excellencies & vertues: yet it seemed by his cruelty, yt God raysed him to chasten the kings & proud people of the earth.¹⁶

He is already in *The English Myrror* "*Tamberlayne* ye Great, surnamed *flagellum dei* . . . worthy the name of vengeance."¹⁷ What more in the way of impetus could Marlowe ask?

Professor Boas¹⁸ noticed that Marlowe placed the incident of the colored tents at Damascus, while Fortescue merely said a "strong and riche citie." Neither does Whetstone supply the name of the city, but his story follows immediately, without a paragraph break, his account of the siege of Damascus.¹⁹ Marlowe would naturally have associated it with Damascus.

Marlowe of course vitalized the bare bones of supposed fact in his source, created most of his characters, correlated characters and situations, amplified events, and liberally supplied his drumming decasyllabons with high astounding terms. Of the dozen words, "Envy had sown discord between the king of *Persia* & his brother," Marlowe makes almost all of his opening scene, for which he creates seven characters. The bit of synopsis—"Tamberlaine ioyned with ye kings brother: and so valiantly behaued him self, yt he ouerthrew the king & seated his brother in the kingdom: the new king created *Tamberlaine*, chiefe captaine of his army"—became the first five scenes of Act II. Whetstone relayed a commonplace observation provoked by the downfall of Bajazet:

a notable example of the incertaintye of worldly fortunes: Bajazet, that in the morning was the mightiest Emperor on the earth, at night, and the residue of his life, was driuen to feede among the dogs, and which might most grieue him, he was thus abased, by one that in the beginning was but a poore shepheard.

This passage quite possibly induced in Marlowe the mood which runs through Zenocrate's speech over the dead bodies of Bajazeth and Zabina:

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 15. Cf. R. W. Battenhouse, "Tamburlaine the 'Scourge of God,'" *PMLA*, LVI (1941), 337-348.

¹⁸ Frederick S. Boas, *Christopher Marlowe* (Oxford, 1940), p. 86.

¹⁹ *The English Myrror*, pp. 81-82.

Earth, cast up fountains from thy entrails,
 And wet thy cheeks for their untimely deaths;
 Shake with their weight in sign of fear and grief.
 Blush heaven, that gave them honour at their birth,
 And let them die a death so barbarous.
 Those that are proud of fickle empery
 And place their chiefest good in earthly pomp,
 Behold the Turk and his great emperess!
 Ah, Tamburlaine, my love, sweet Tamberlaine,
 That fightst for sceptres and for slippery crowns,
 Behold the Turk and his great emperess! ²⁰

Further examples of this kind were cited by Leslie Spence,²¹ though it would seem more reasonable to ascribe them to *The English Myrror* as a source, rather than to *The Forest*.

Of course, Marlowe drew allusions and details of character and plot from many other authorities, as has often been demonstrated. But practically all of his plot could have come from *The English Myrror* with a few supplementary details from Perondinus, Lonicerus, and Chalcondylas. Marlowe appears to have made use of every scrap of information on Tamburlaine contained in Whetstone's book.

The assumption that Marlowe used Whetstone eliminates the necessity of examining a number of related accounts. In addition to Fortescue, Gruget (whom both Fortescue and Whetstone were translating) may be omitted, as well as Mexia, who was Gruget's ultimate source. Then the list of authorities whom Gruget cited as his sources (following Mexia, and partially cited by Whetstone) seem no longer necessary, since all their information used by Marlowe is supplied by Whetstone. They were announced by Gruget ²² as Battista Fregoso, Pope Pius II, Platina, Palmerius, Cambinus, and Baptista Ignatius.

Mr. Bakeless was understandably led astray in the maze of sources for *Tamburlaine*. He says:

Again, Marlowe's Tamburlaine delights in calling himself "the scourge of God." Nothing like this appears in Mexia or Perondinus; but it does appear in several of the other books, notably in the Corpus Christi copy of

²⁰ v, ii, 285 ff.

²¹ "The Influence of Marlowe's Sources on Tamburlaine I," *MP*, xxiv (1926), 181-199.

²² Page 399.

Pope Pius's *Asiae Europaeque Elegantissima Descriptio* (1531), where Tamburlaine is made to say: "I am the wrath of God and the destruction of the world."

Yet again, while most sources say that the Persian kings sent out a thousand soldiers to capture Tamburlaine, most of them are silent as to the number of Tamburlaine's own troops. But Baptista Fulgotius and Philip Lonicer give the same figure that Marlowe gives: "The number came to five hundred."²²

It was unnecessary to search out Pope Pius, Baptista Fulgotius, and Philip Lonicer—they with their Latin. All this information was to be had in the none too elegant but perfectly clear and easily accessible English of *The English Myrror* by Marlowe's contemporary and fellow-Londoner, George Whetstone.

THOMAS C. IZARD

Columbia University

THE PLAY OF THEANO

In the late Professor G. C. Moore-Smith's collection of extracts from Cambridge college records, published in the Malone Society *Collections*, II, ii, under the title "The Academic Drama at Cambridge," there is included among the accounts for Queen's College a list of players' garments borrowed from the college tower by John Mey.¹ Most of these garments are described in terms of the materials of which they were made ("cassokes of white satten," "a white damaske coote," etc.), but a few are associated with the rôles for which they were used, rôles drawn for the most part from classical literature. Thus there are references to "Apollos coote," "Thrasos coote," "mercuris coot," and "Theanoes coote." Apollo, Thraso, and Mercury are at once recognized as "type" rôles, which can be identified with no particular story; hence, all that can be deduced from their occurrence in the costume list is that the plays in which they were used were classical or contained classical elements. Theano, however, is not a dramatic type, but a very minor figure in classical literature. Accordingly, it is perhaps possible to identify the specific story of the Cambridge play in which Theano was one of the rôles.

²² John Bakeless, *Christopher Marlowe* (New York, 1937), p. 125.

¹ Pp. 196-198.

An examination of classical literature shows, first of all, that the "Play of Theano" was not a classical original, but was written by a student of Queen's. Whether Mey himself was the author is uncertain, for so little is known about the detailed process of keeping the university records² that it is impossible to determine whether in listing "Theanoes coote" he was describing the garment in terms of its former use or in terms of the rôle for which he intended it. At court, the names of dramatic characters were sometimes sewed upon the backs and breasts of their robes.³ If the costumes at Queen's were similarly decorated, then Mey was possibly copying onto his list merely the names sewed on the cloaks he was borrowing. Especially for the costumes of such well-known characters as Apollo, Mercury, and Thraso may this supposition be allowed, for they could be used repeatedly without alteration. Since Theano, however, is not a type rôle, it is highly improbable that it appeared in plays often enough for a robe to be reserved for it. In other words, had "Theanoes coote" been used very long before Mey borrowed it, the name which may have been sewed on it probably would have been replaced by another. If we assume as a first possibility, then, that the "Play of Theano" was not written by Mey, we must conclude that it was written by an immediate predecessor. The other possibility, of course, is that Mey himself was the first to use Theano in drama, and was thinking of the rôle when he entered the coat for it on the list of costumes. To decide definitely for either alternative is both unwise and unnecessary, since it is not the authorship of the play but its story that is of primary importance in this instance.

Whatever John Mey's actual connection with the play may be, the fact that he borrowed "Theanoes coote" is of value in dating the play and thereby establishing a time limit on the available sources. He proceeded B. A. in 1549-1550 and was appointed Fellow in 1550.⁴ Inasmuch as undergraduate students did not

² Moore-Smith, the best authority on the Cambridge accounts, sheds no light in either the Malone Society volume or in his work of commentary, *College Plays Performed in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1923).

³ Cf. A. Feuillerat, *Documents Relating to the Revels under Queen Elizabeth* (Louvain, 1908), p. 20. The garments there mentioned were probably holdovers from Edward's reign. (Cf. Feuillerat, *Documents Relating to the Office of the Revels at Court in the Time of King Edward VI and Queen Mary* [Louvain, 1914], pp. 133-5.)

⁴ Cooper, *Athenae Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge, 1858), II, 233-4.

supervise plays at that time, Mey must have obtained the garment no earlier than 1550. The latest date at which he may have borrowed the coat is 1554-5, when he held the office of bursar, though, as we shall see later, his last recorded supervision of a play was in 1553-4.⁵ Sometime, then, between 1550 and 1554, "Theanoes coote" was borrowed for use in a play; hence, it is necessary to consider as possible sources of information about Theano only those works which were available before 1554. Since we have concluded that the play in which Theano appears was written, if not by Mey, by a near predecessor, we can set our backward limit at about 1540, at the very earliest. Possibly, then, our sources have to antedate 1540.

By applying the later limit, we can reduce the ten different Theanos recorded in classical literature to nine.⁶ Of these nine, two may be rejected from further consideration because of the fact that the references to them are merely genealogical, and hence not adaptable for dramatic purposes. The two so excluded are Theano, daughter of the Thracian king Kisses and wife of Antenor,⁷ but according to *Aeneid* x, 703, daughter of the Trojan Amykos; and Theano, a Cretan woman, daughter of Pythonax, wife of Pythagoras—but sometimes indicated as daughter of Brontinus of Croton and pupil of Pythagoras—and writer of philosophical commentaries, apothegms, and poems.⁸ Two additional Theanos that may be straightway dismissed are those vaguely alluded to by Suidas and Antiphanes.⁹

The remaining Theanos are more likely candidates for dramatic rôles because of the fact that some story is connected with them. Two of them, however, are so briefly sketched in classical records as to make it improbable that a university student would have attempted to use them as dramatic material. One is a Theban woman whose abduction by a Phocian led to the Sacred War;¹⁰ and

⁵ Moore-Smith, *Malone Society Collections*, II, ii, 189.

⁶ For an account of the various Theanos, cf. Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen altertumswissenschaft*, Second Series, V, ii (Stuttgart, 1934), 1377-81.

⁷ *Iliad*, XI, 223 and VI, 299; also *Ambrosii Calepini Dictionarum*, ed. 1548.

⁸ Diogenes Laertius, *De Vitis*, VIII, 42 f.; *Ambrosii Calepini Dictionarum*; Thomas Cooper, *Thesaurus linguae romanae et britannicae*.

⁹ Pauly, *loc. cit.*

¹⁰ Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, XIII, 560b.

the other is a Lacedaemonian woman who, when her son Pausanias sought refuge from public justice in the temple of Minerva, laid a tile in the doorway, thereby suggesting to the authorities that the temple be sealed up so as to punish the offender without arousing the goddess.¹¹ Both of these stories are too bare of details to have been readily adaptable for dramatic treatment. Equally bare and even less adaptable is the story of still another Theano, daughter of Menon of Agraule, and priestess of Demeter and Cora, who, when ordered to curse Alcibiades publicly for mimicking the mysteries, refused to follow the order on the grounds that she was a praying, not a cursing, priestess.¹²

We have thus disposed of seven Theanos on the grounds of dramatic inadaptability. Fortunately, the two remaining sources appeared in print before 1540, and hence were available to the author of our play, whether he was Mey or one of his predecessors. Furthermore, these last two Theanos are involved in stories which have sufficient detail and dramatic incident to be written into play form. One is to be found in Plutarch's *Amatoriae Narrationes*.¹³ The story centers around not Theano, but her father Scedasus, a poor but hospitable man. With his two daughters, Hippo and Miletia (or Theano and Euxippe), he once entertained two Spartan youths, who returned the kindness at a later date by ravishing and killing the girls. Scedasus, after seeking in vain for justice from the ephors and citizens of Lacedaemon, finally killed himself in despair. The general structure of the plot, plus a few additional details given by Plutarch, makes this story an excellent subject for drama: it has all the elements of bloody tragedy. Even so, this Theano is probably not the one referred to in the Cambridge records. In the first place, she plays a relatively minor part in Plutarch's account, so that it seems unlikely that a particular costume associated with the rôle should be designated by her name. Furthermore, *Theano* is an alternate name; a young playwright using this story would probably have employed the more customary *Hippo*. These objections gain added force from the fact that the only remaining possibility, the narrative given in Hyginus' *Fabulae*,¹⁴ meets all conditions more satisfactorily. In this latter

¹¹ Polyaeus, *Stratagematum*, VIII, 51.

¹² Plutarch, *Vitae Parallelae*, Alcibiades, XXII.

¹³ *Moralia*, x, 773c-774d.

¹⁴ No. 186.

version, Theano is definitely a major center of interest, and the plot more nearly approaches the Senecan pattern of tragic story than does Plutarch's anecdote. Because the account of Hyginus seems a more likely source than Plutarch, we shall center the rest of our discussion upon it, as though it were unquestionably the source. At the same time Plutarch must be kept in mind as an alternative to which will apply equally well our final conclusions about Hyginus' Theano.

According to Hyginus, Theano, Queen of Icaria, was ordered by King Metapontus, her husband, to bear him a son to succeed to the reign upon his death. Faced with the prospect of being put away if she did not obey the royal injunction, Theano appealed for help to some shepherds, who brought to her two boys they had found on the mountainside. (They were twins who had been born to Melanippe and Neptune, and had been placed at the mercy of wild animals by Desmontes, the enraged father of Melanippe.) Not long after Theano had given these boys to Metapontus as his own, she gave birth to twins herself. The king's favor, however, remained attached to the first set of boys. Anxious that her own children be heirs to the kingdom, Theano incited them, when they were older, to kill the two substituted boys while out hunting. They failed in the attempt, however; the intended victims, with the aid of their father Neptune, killed Theano's sons. When the bodies were brought before the Queen, she killed herself with a hunting knife. The surviving boys, informed by Neptune of their true parentage, liberated their mother, Melanippe, from the prison in which Desmontes had placed her, and brought her to Icaria, where Metapontus married her and took the boys again as his own.

It is at once evident that a play written upon this story would have been a bloody tragedy of the Senecan variety, and possibly even a conscious imitation of Seneca, for at about this time was beginning that interest in Seneca which was to result within a decade in Jasper Heywood's translations. In 1551-2, John Malham had supervised the performance of *Troades* at Trinity College,¹⁵ and we know the connections between Queen's and Trinity were fairly close, for on January 8, 1547-8, and January 14, 1548-9, students of Trinity gave dramatic presentations at Queen's.¹⁶ In

¹⁵ Moore-Smith, *Malone Society Collections*, II, ii, 155.

¹⁶ Moore-Smith, *College Plays Performed in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1923), p. 19.

view of this early interest in Seneca, it is quite likely that John Mey or one of his immediate predecessors attempted to write an imitation and went to Hyginus for his story. The Cambridge records indicate that Mey gave a *lusus* in February, 1551-2, and a tragedy in January, 1553-4, the expenses for each of which amounted to the same, 25s. 7d.¹⁷ Possibly at one of those times the tragedy of Theano was performed.

If such a play actually was produced, and the evidence for it seems good, then it stands as a transition work between the early performances of Seneca and the later *Gorboduc*, an English play modeled upon Seneca. Because of its classic subject matter, we have indicated that it probably was written in Latin; for such few plays as were written in English usually were topical plays, based on life in England.¹⁸ Thus the play of Theano falls into the general pattern of the Renaissance domestication into English of the classics: first, the development of an understanding of the original; second, the attempt to imitate the form and spirit of the original in its own language; and, finally, the attempt to imitate it in English. The story of Theano, as told by Hyginus, is exactly what we might expect a Cambridge graduate student to have written into a play around the middle of the sixteenth century, and is therefore probably to be associated with "Theanoes coote."

EDWIN W. ROBBINS

University of Illinois

A NOTE ON *THE TEMPEST*: A SEQUEL

Few if any Shakespearean words have received more comment than *pioned* and *twilled* in *The Tempest* iv, i, 64. In the *New Variorum* (1892), after using almost six pages reviewing discussions of them, Doctor Furness concludes: "I doubt if there be any corruption in these lines. . . . As agricultural or horticultural terms, 'pioned' and 'twilled' will be some day, probably, sufficiently explained to enable us to weave from them chaste crowns for cold nymphs." In this statement, he agrees with William Aldis Wright

¹⁷ Moore-Smith, *Malone Society Collections*, II, ii, 188-9.

¹⁸ Cf. Moore-Smith, *College Plays Performed in the University of Cambridge*, pp. 39-40.

(1874), before him, the most severely accurate Shakespeare scholar. An edition of *The Tempest* (Scribner, 1929) says: "No satisfactory explanation of this passage has been found." Merriam-Webster (1934) citing only this occurrence of *pioned* and *twilled*, enters: "A word of disputed meaning"; and: "The meaning is in dispute." Conjectural emendations before and since the *Variorum*, assuming that the text was corrupt, have substituted for *pioned* and *twilled* the names of flowers: "peonied," and "lillied" being preferred.

Morton Luce, laborious and persistent editor of *The Tempest* (Arden Series, London, 1901; "revised and enlarged," 1918; a "fifth edition" 1938) has won a following for the flowers emendation. He says in his note on *pioned* and *twilled*: "These words are probably the most celebrated of all the verbal difficulties in Shakespeare, and their examination must be reserved for an appendix." Careful analysis of the appendix reveals that the premises are (1) the extent and variety of Ceres' realm, and (2) certain parallels between Iris's introduction and Ceres' answers. "The context, therefore, must seem to support any interpretation that makes flowers or plants of *pioned* and *twilled* . . . my choice would be the April 'peony, and lillies of all sorts' of Bacon's Essay on Gardens." The premises by no means warrant the conclusion. Other interpretations are rather hastily pushed aside; they have been, assumedly, refuted by the flowers argument. But "sedg'd crowns," not "peonied" or "lillied," occurs in line 129. That the "brims" are first "*pioned* and *twilled*," then "betrimmed"—the obvious order in the text—is regarded as offering no difficulty, after the bolder, wholly unnecessary substitutions for words of the text, in their proper meaning, strictly applicable.

New interest in the discussion is stirred by the most recent issue (Ginn, 1939) of *The Tempest*, edited by the late Professor George Lyman Kittredge, who notes:

Pioned and *twilled*: trenched (scored, furrowed) and ridged, ridgy (marked as by ridges between furrows). To *pion* is to dig, to excavate (whence the noun *pioneer* or *pioneer*—a soldier whose duty is to make entrenchments and do other heavy work). To *twill* is to weave (cloth) so as to produce in the fabric the appearance of diagonal raised lines. The whole phrase describes the channeled and indented appearance of the edges of each elevated bank, worn and caved as they have been by the current and by the weather of winter and early spring.

Professor Kittredge apparently missed or disregarded my contribution, "A Note on *The Tempest*," *MLN.*, xxv (1910), 8-9. Although he is the first editor to abandon explicitly the explanation of *pioned* and *twilled* as names of flowers, and practically to adopt my explanation, he makes no mention of the "Note" of 1910. His note requires two emendations—not conjectural. First: To *pion*, used for its poetic value, does mean "to dig, to excavate"; but it also means, more directly here, to *embank*, as in the citation given in *NED.* from *The Faerie Queene*, II. x. 63:

Yet oft annoyed with sondry bordragings
Of neighbor Scots, and forrein scatterlings,
With which the world did in those dayes abound:
Which to outbarre, with painefull pyonings
From sea to sea he heapt a mighty mound.

Second: "To 'pion' is to dig, to excavate (whence the noun *pioner* or *pioneer*—)." The etymology, as Skeat correctly records it, is in the opposite direction. The *pioner* was a foot soldier (*pes*, *pedis*: cf. *peon*; *pawn*, a piece in chess) whose duty was mining, sapping, or raising fortifications. *Pion*, to dig, or to embank, is clearly derived from *pioner*; not *pioner* from *pion*.

"To *twill* is to weave (cloth)," implying that *twilled* is a trope, agrees with the interpretation of thirty-three years ago. On *twilled* cloth, however, not merely "the appearance of diagonal lines," but, in weaving, actual ridges in absolute regularity are produced on the surface of the cloth. "The whole phrase describes the channeled and indented appearance of the edges of each elevated bank worn and caved as they have been by the current and by the weather of winter and early spring." Nothing in "channeled and indented" even remotely suggests the regularity of the *twilled* effect; still less in "worn and caved." Once more: not *twilled* "edges"; imagination must create "*twilled brims*"—top surface of the bank on each side of the stream—"Which spongy April at thy best betrimms."

Another beautiful trope occurs in lines 62-63:

Thy turfy mountains, where live nibbling sheep,
And flat meads *thatch'd* with stover them to heap.

Incidentally, *stover* is not "a kind of grass"; here, it is hay—probably of several kinds of grass—stored to feed the sheep during the winter. "*Fodder*" is correct; *roughage* is the general word.

The crucial question is: how constructed were the "banks with pioned and twilled brims"? The method is suggested by the practice of *pioners* in erecting fortifications. That Shakespeare was well informed on their work is evinced by his use of *pioner* figuratively in *Hamlet*, literally of soldiers in *Henry V*, III, ii, 92, and in *Othello*, III, iii, 346. To strengthen their earthen structures, the pioners reinforced them with *fascines*, defined (Merriam-Webster) as "a long bundle of sticks of wood bound together, used in raising batteries, strengthening ramparts . . . revetments for river banks etc." *NED*. in a fuller discussion, says: "Fascine sb. Also fachine," and quotes: "(1723) A large Dike or Peer [*sic*] made of Fachines and Earth." On a larger scale probably, but this last may be quite close to what Shakespeare may have seen or imagined done on the banks of the Avon to prevent inundation. The practice is still general in the country wherever the flow of water on a relatively small scale is to be controlled, whether to prevent inundation or erosion, to reinforce a bank of earth with brush or branches, usually not in fascines, or faggots, as also called, placed between the layers of earth.

Pioned, yes; but how *twilled brims*? The explanation offered here, not a "conjectural emendation," rather an interpretation that fits the conditions and has the support of what appears to be sufficient evidence; that accepts, without alteration in form or obvious meaning, the text as contained in *each of the four folios*. This interpretation may be stated simply. In pioning—heaping up—the banks on each side of the Avon or other stream, between successive layers of earth were placed, as reinforcement, a layer of branches, or, as a possibility, small faggots. The layer of earth on top—the *brim*—would sink between branches or faggots, creating a surface ridged across with sufficient regularity to justify the happy trope, *twilled brims*. Repairs to the banks each spring are minor; the banks in their greater length are intact. There "spongy April" has abundant space ready to "betrim" with sedges and flowers.

In conclusion, the argument for this explanation of *pioned and twilled brims* has its most convincing evidence in *Handbook of Erosion-Control Engineering on the National Forests*, issued (1936) by the U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Forest Service. Erosion is not identical with inundation, but they often overlap. Lack of space forbids to say more than that therein described and effectively illustrated are earthen banks reinforced with fascines elaborately

made; with bundles of willow twigs and brush wattles—both fagots, or small fascines. Thus the banks are *pioned*; and the resulting surfaces, as shown in illustrations, are amazingly *twilled*. Let this *Sequel* close as did the Note thirty-three years ago. Is it too much to hope that the prophecy of Doctor Furness has—at long last—been fulfilled? “As agricultural or horticultural terms, ‘pioned’ and ‘twilled’ [brims] will be some day, probably, sufficiently explained to enable us to weave from them the chaste crowns for cold nymphs.” And then the added thought: From this most appropriate and beautiful masque, one gets an idea of “the delight with which Shakespeare saw Warwickshire in his youth.”

THOMAS P. HARRISON, SR.

North Carolina State College
of Agriculture and Engineering

“MEN MAY GROPE 'S IN SUCH A SCARRE”

One of the most unintelligible lines in Shakespeare occurs in the short speech (*All's Well that Ends Well*, iv, ii, 38, 39) in which Diana pretends to accede to Bertram's love-suit. She says:

I see that men make rope's in such a scarre,
That wee'l forsake our selues. Giue me that Ring.

Thus the lines are printed in the Folio, which is the only authority. Charles D. Stewart, in *Some Textual Difficulties in Shakespeare* (1914, pp. 44-51), has written an ingenious and romantic essay in interpretation of the text (virtually) as it stands, and at the close he lists twenty-one attempts by other critics to introduce sense by change of words. Mr. Dover Wilson suggests yet another, “make rapes in such a scour” (“New Cambridge” ed., 1929, p. 168), and is bold enough to say that it “gives good sense.”

The number of attempted emendations might doubtless be indefinitely increased, but they all indicate that the passage is one not likely to be explained by verbal ingenuity alone. I suggest that the clue to it is found in a line of *Measure for Measure* (I, ii, 96), where Pompey, on being asked what is Claudio's offence, replies,

Groping for trouts in a peculiar river.

The figure, of course, is from capturing fish by “groping” (*OED*

s. v. Grope 2. b). It is much the same figure that Maria uses of Malvolio in *Twelfth Night*, II, v, 25:

here comes the trout that must be caught with tickling.

I believe that Diana has the same image in mind and that her speech should read:

I see that men may grope 's (i. e., grope us) in such a scarre
That we 'll forsake ourselves.

"Scarre," which Onions' *Shakespeare Glossary* declines to explain, I take to mean a submerged or partly submerged rock, affording a point of vantage for the "groper." The Oxford Dictionary recognizes the sense of "A low or sunken rock in the sea," and Wright's *Dialect Dictionary* cites the use of *scar* for "A ridge of rocks; a bed of rough gravel or stones; especially a rocky place on which cockles or mussels abound." These seem to be maritime references. I would welcome instances of the word in connection with inland, and especially Warwickshire, waters. What Diana seems to mean to say is, "I see that men may beguile us in such a situation (or with the aid of such a posture of circumstances) that we 'll consent to capture."

The misprint I impute to the printer of *All's Well* is reasonable on the assumption that he was not an angler and could make no sense of Shakespeare's metaphor. The preservation of the apostrophe in *make rope's* indicates that it is not purely an error of sound, as if he were printing from dictation, although this might be so. It is more probably the work of the printer's subconsciousness which, when his conscious mind could find no meaning in the words before him, arbitrarily substituted other words of nearly the same sound.

II

This seems a proper place to call belated attention to a textual change which I have made without exegetical comment (and without knowing that Howard Staunton, in a footnote of his later, 1874, edition, had offered the same conjecture) in an edition of *The Merchant of Venice* (*Shakespeare's Principal Plays*, 3rd. ed., 1935).

The passage is Act IV, scene i, lines 50 ff., of that play. Shylock,

arguing his right to have his "humor" in the full and rigorous fulfillment of the bond, says,

Some men there are love not a gaping pig,

and after mentioning other examples of personal idiosyncrasy, concludes:

for affection.

Masters of passion swayes it to the moode
of what it likes or loathes.

This is the First Quarto form; the Folio and the other Quarto differ in no noticeable detail except that they spell *Masters* instead of *Maisters*. Modern editors agree in ignoring the period at the end of the first line; and almost all follow Thirlby in reading *Mistress of passion*, though Johnson, the Arden editor, and Dover Wilson prefer *Master of passion*.

I think Thirlby emended the wrong word, and that the passage should read: "Masters *our* passion." If Shakespeare wrote "our" in the form "o^r," as was commonly done in manuscript (the raised "r" standing for "ur"), the word would have been very similar to "of" in many hands. So read, the line is clearer, I think, and stronger; for Shylock is not saying that "affection" (whim or idiosyncrasy) is normally passion's mistress (*i. e.*, darling, queen, complement, or whatever), but rather that it can on occasion overpower and divert it.

TUCKER BROOKE

Yale University

A PRINCIPAL SOURCE OF *THE BATTLE OF ALCAZAR*

The Battle of Alcazar, generally attributed to George Peele, is not a literary masterpiece; but it is an interesting play for a number of reasons, and has been much studied, most elaborately by Mr. W. W. Greg, who worked out the relations between the "plot" and the quarto text of 1594 and submitted both to a careful analysis in *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: The Battle of Alcazar and Orlando Furioso*, Oxford, 1923. Mr. Greg agreed with earlier writers in stating that Peele took his materials chiefly from Freigius' *Historia de bello Africano*. It has not been pointed out, however, that the playwright almost certainly read this work

in the English translation printed by John Polemon in *The Second Part of the Booke of Battailes, Fought in Our Age: Taken out of the Best Authors and Writers in Sundrie Languages. Published for the Profit of Those That Practise Armes, and for the Pleasure of Such as Loue to be Harmlesse Hearers of Bloudie Broiles*, London, 1587. Here the two longest accounts of famous battles stand together, and describe contests between Christians and Moslems. They are: "The Battaile of Pescherias [i. e., Lepanto], betwene Don Iohn & Ali Bassa, in An. 1572. Out of Peter Contarini," and "The Battaile of Alcazar, fought in Barbarie, betwene Sebastian the king of Portugall, and Abdelmelec, king of Marocco, in An. 1578. Out of Freigius."

Reference to Polemon's translation clears up several points which have perplexed Mr. Greg and others. The insistence upon Mahamet's dark complexion (noticed by Mr. Greg, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-103) is found in the *Booke of Battailes* as well as in the play:

Abdelmelec . . . was of a meane stature, of a fine proportion of bodie, with brode shoulders, white face, but intermixed with red, which did gallantlie garnish his cheekes, a blacke beard thicke, and curled, great eies and graie. In summe, he was a verie proper man, and verie comelie in all his actions and iestures, and verie strong. . . . But as touching his nephew Muley [Ma]Hamet,¹ he was younger then Abdelmelec, being about xxix. or xxx. yeeres of age: of stature meane, of bodie weake, of colour so blacke, that he was accompted of many for a Negro or black Moore² (fols. Y2b, Y3a).

¹ Corrected from "Hamet" to "Mahamet" in the list of "Fautes escaped."

² Mahamet is later referred to as "the Negro" (fol. T4a). The distinction was often made in Elizabethan times between "black Moors" and "white Moors." Mr. E. S. Sugden has collected, in his *Topographical Dictionary to the Works of Shakespeare and his Fellow Dramatists* (Manchester, 1925), p. 351, a long list of quotations which prove that in Shakespeare's time (as Mr. Greg remarks) the Moor was generally thought of as black, and often confused with the Negro. Captain John Smith noted, in his *True Travels*, that "King Mully Hamet was not blacke . . . but molata, or tawnie,"—like the Prince in *The Merchant of Venice*. See Henri de Castries, *Les Sources inédites de l'histoire du Maroc*, Première série, dynastie Saadienne: Archives et bibliothèques d'Angleterre (Paris, 1925), II, 269. In *The Thracian Wonder* the mention of a "white Moor" looks toward the distinction made by Wilkins in his *Three Miseries of Barbary* (in De Castries, *op. cit.*, II, 255-256) between Lelia Isa, the "fairest," and Lilia Ageda, the "Negro," two wives of Mahamet.

Similarly, Peele is following his source, not independently "recasting history" (Greg, p. 103) when he makes Mahamet the murderer not only of his brother but also of his uncle Abdelmunen (fols. S2b, S3a), and is excusably misled into thinking Sultan Amurath to be the son of Solyman (p. 82) by Polemon's statements (fol. S3a). The text in the *Booke of Battailes* also clears up a good many minor matters—e. g., the difficulty in line 1142 of the play (Greg, p. 116) is explained by the translation (fol. X2a).

As for the names of characters, the Lodouico Caesar of the play (Greg, p. 84) appears in Polemon's version as Ludouicke (fol. X2a), and perhaps the puzzling "Argerd" Zareo (Greg, p. 82) may now be read "Argere" Zareo (or at any rate interpreted as "Zareo of Argier"), inasmuch as Polemon relates that Abadallas' brothers fled to "Argier," and that Abdelmelec, when he set out to depose Mahamet and gain the throne "came to Argier with mandates of the Turkish Emperour, in whome it was contained, that the capitaines in those parts, should supply vnto him all things needeful for the warres" (fol. S3b). To be sure, not all the names of Peele's characters can yet be traced; but his Hercules, Diego Lopis, Pisano, are probably borrowed from the list of Christian captains engaged at Lepanto (in Polemon's version of Contarini's "Battaile of Pescherias"), where Hercules Lotta, Diego Lopez de Diglia, and George Pisano appear together (fol. M3a). Abdil Rayes (Abdula Rais) (Greg, p. 83) and Celybin (Greg, p. 84) are likewise borrowed from the lists of the names of Turkish captains present at the great naval engagement (fol. P1b), while Calsepius (Calcepius) may have been suggested by "Calcepy Iusuf" (fol. O4b), and Callipolis by such notes as "These gallies were of Callipoli" (fol. O3b). The "County Vinioso" who originally appeared in Act II, Sc. iv (Greg, pp. 110-111) seems to be borrowed from Polemon's account of "The Battaile of Saint Michael, fought by Sea, betweene the Marques of Santa Cruz, and Philippe Lord Strozzi, in An. 1582," where the ("Earle of Vimioso") is mentioned (fols. Bb2a, Bb3a).

The closeness with which Peele, in uninspired moments, follows his source may be judged from the following passages:

In the meane time the king of Portugal beeing issued out of Arzil, and readie to march, mustered his armie, wherein (besides the thousand stipendiaries, that he had left to keepe the fleete, and the two thousand that

hee had sent to Massaga) he had foureteene thousand footemen, and two thousand horsmen, a great part armed.

Moreouer, there were three thousand pioners, and aboue a thousand cochmen, and almost an infinite number of drudges, slaues, Negroes, mullothers, horse boies, landresses, and those sweete wenches that the Frenchmen doe merrilie call the daughters of delight, for now the world is come to that, we thinke we cannot keepe wars without these snailles. So that all y^t insauorie companie did excede sixe and twentie thousand persons. . . . And the greatest parte of these forces had their wages sparingly and verie ill paide them, and were distressed with want, and many other illis, for now victuals beganne to faile, the which were so sparinglie distributed, that many died for hunger (fol. U2b).

Abdilm. Now tell mee Celybin, what doeth the enemie?

Celybin. The enemie dread lord, hath left the towne
Of Areil, with a thousand souldiers armed,
To gard his fleet of thirteene hundred saile,
And mustering of his men before the wals,
He found he had two thousand armed horse,
And foureteene thousand men that serue on foot,
Three thousand pioners, and a thousand cochmen,
Besides a number almost numberlesse
Of drudges, Negroes, slaues and Muliters,
Horse-boies, landresses and curtizans,
And fifteene hundred waggons full of stuffe
For noble men, brought vp in delicate.

Abdil. Alas good king, thy fore-sight hath bin small
To come with women into Barbarie,
With landresse, with baggage, and with trash,
Numbers vnfit to multiplie thy hoast.

Cely. Their paiment in the campe is passing slow,
And victuals scarce, that many faint and die.

(Lines 1077-95.)

WARNER G. RICE

University of Michigan

MICHEL GUY DE TOURS: SOME SOURCES AND LITERARY METHODS

Blanchemain, in his edition of Guy de Tours, notices two or three instances in which the poet has lifted lines bodily from Ronsard, and remarks that Guy is evidently at no pains to conceal these borrowings.¹ Other examples of this practice could be added

¹ *Premières Œuvres et Souspirs amoureux de Guy de Tours* and *Le*

to those observed by Blanchemain,² and in fact so far is Guy from concealing his character of *ronsardisant fidèle* that he founds upon it his chief claim to the attention of posterity ('Au jardin de deffunct Monsieur de Ronsard'):

O beau jardin, s'il te demeure encor
 Quelque tresor d'un si rare tresor,
 Enrichis-en ma muse peu vantée,
 A celle fin que nos plus tards nepveux
 Puissent sçavoir que j'estois un de ceux
 Qui de Ronsard ont leur gloire empruntée.³

No doubt the very fact that writers like Guy were unable to quit the 'jardin de deffunct Monsieur de Ronsard' is a reason why their Muse is 'peu vantée,' but Guy's manner of decorating his poems with flowers from that source is so frank as to amount to a kind of originality. Besides whole verses he has culled a good many phrases and epithets. In the lines just quoted, for example, the phrase 'nos plus tards nepveux' is, as I recall, a Ronsardian expression. Like Ronsard he fell in love at the age of twenty, 'Sur mes vingt ans,'⁴ with a girl of fifteen, 'belle fleur de quinze ans,' like Cassandre.⁵ I have not attempted to collect such parallels, but

Paradis d'Amour, 2 vols. ('Trésor des vieux poètes français'), Paris, 1878, 2. 105. Guy published his poems in 1598, and in 1611 a prose-novel, *Les Amours de Paris et de la nymphe Œnone*. Notices by François Colletet (quoted by Blanchemain), Goujet, and La Monnoye contain no information that cannot be deduced from his books. He was born at Tours, probably about 1562, the son of a prosperous lawyer, Michel Guy (†1595), *procureur au siège présidial de Tours*, and himself entered the legal profession. After his father's death he seems to have settled in Paris. He gives a portrait of himself in an *envoi* to his poems (*ed. cit.* 2. 98). There is an article, not accessible to me, by L. Langlois in *Bull. de la Soc. archéol. de Tours*, 1903-4, concerning one Anne Méon as the Anne of Guy's sonnets.

² E.g., 'Belle, ne garde point à Pluton ta beauté' (*ed. cit.* 1.64) = Ronsard, 'Ne garde point à Pluton ta beauté' (*Œuv.*, ed. by Marty-Laveaux, Paris, 1881, 1. 63).

³ *Ed. cit.* 2. 65. Guy has two other sonnets on Ronsard (*ed. cit.* 1. 29 and 2. 87), the first addressed to the 'roi des poètes français,' as he calls him, as still living, the second an epitaph. A native of Tours, he may have met or at least seen Ronsard there. Since Marcel Raymond's *L'Influence de Ronsard sur la poésie française* (Paris, 1927) concludes with the year 1585, Guy does not come within its scope; he is mentioned casually (2. 218, 349) as a continuator of the 'Catullan' style.

⁴ *Ed. cit.* 1. 28; Ronsard, *ed. cit.* 1. 55 ('Sur mes vingt ans').

⁵ Guy 1. 64; Ronsard 1. 11 ('un beauté de quinze ans').

we shall meet with others as we proceed. More interesting is the founding of entire sonnets upon Ronsard, a practice of which at least two instances occur, one the introductory sonnet to Guy's *Mignardises*, the other the final sonnet of his *Souspirs*. Unless other cases have escaped my notice, as is quite possible, Guy may have thought it somehow appropriate to make more or less open allusions to his master at these points. The first example follows: *

Ronsard

Dessus l'autel d'Amour planté sur vostre table
 Me fistes un serment, je vous le fis aussi,
 Que d'un cœur mutuel à s'aimer endurey
 Nostre amitié promise iroit inviolable.
 Je vous juray ma foy, vous feistes le semblable,
 Mais vostre cruauté, qui des Dieux n'a soucy,
 Me promettoit de bouche et me trompoit ainsi:
 Cependant vostre esprit demeureroit immuable.
 O jurement fardé sous l'espece d'un Bien!
 O perjurable autel! ta Deité n'est rien.
 O parole d'amour non jamais assurée!
 J'ay pratiqué par vous le proverbe des vieux:
 Jamais des amoureux la parole jurée
 N'entra (pour les punir) aux oreilles des Dieux.

Guy de Tours

Dessus l'autel d'Amour je veux ce mois icy
 Ce beau mois consacré à l'alme Cytherée,
 Vous jurer saintement, ô ma belle Nérée,
 Que serez désormais mon amoureux soucy.
 Mais je veux qu'en après vous me juriez aussi
 Que seulement de moy serez enamorée;
 Ainsi nostre amitié l'un à l'autre jurée
 Laira tousjours en nous d'un feu bien éclairci.
 O d'Amour et du Ris, Venus douce nourrice,
 Soit que tu sois en Cypre, en Paphe, ou en Eryce,
 Entens ces juremens et ces mystiques vœux!
 Et fais que ton enfant à jamais soit contraire
 A qui d'elle ou de moy sera si temeraire
 De premier les enfreindre et d'en rompre les nœuds.

With his opening phrase Guy has, quite intentionally given the signal that his sonnet is to be compared with Ronsard's. The connection once seen, his more hopeful treatment of the theme gains a certain piquancy from comparison with the melancholy

* Ronsard, *Sonnets pour Hélène*, in *ed. cit.* 1. 286; Guy 2. 29.

ending of his model, and such must have been his intention; for no doubt he imagined that his readers would always be verbally familiar with the 'king of French poets.' Guy's sonnet has further interest as illustrating the imperceptible diffusion of classical themes, since, as I shall show elsewhere, its original, Ronsard's sonnet, is little more than an 'inspired translation' of a Greek epigram by Callimachus.

The final sonnet of the *Souspirs* is founded on the penultimate sonnet of the *Sonnets pour Hélène*, but the manner of derivation differs from that in the case just cited.⁷

Ronsard

Je faisais ces Sonnets en l'antré Piéride,
Quand on vit les François sous les armes suer,
Quand on vit tout le peuple en fureur se ruer,
Quand Bellone sanglante alloit devant pour guide:
Quand en lieu de la Loy le vice, l'homicide . . .
Estoyent tiltres d'honneur. . . .
Pour tromper les soucis d'un temps si vicieux
J'escrivois en ces vers ma complainte inutile. . . .

Guy de Tours

Triste je souspiroy cette plainte amoureuse,
Assis dans le giron de la belle Eraton,
Quand l'horrible Megere et sa sœur Alecon
Rendoient de toutes parts la France malheureuse,
Quand les François mutins, d'une dague outrageuse
S'entrecoupoient le fil que leur tramoit Clothon, . . .
Quand nos princes Bourbons et les princes Lorrains
Avoient pour s'esgorger le coutelas aux mains. . . .
Pour n'ouyr leurs débats ny le bruit des canons
Ny voir les estandars de tant de gonfanons,
J'escrivois en ces vers mon amoureuse plainte.

In this instance Guy does not alter the sentiment of Ronsard, but makes it his artistic aim to vary the expression—'dans le giron de la belle Eraton' for 'en l'antré Piéride,' 'l'horrible Megere et sa sœur Alecon' for 'Bellone sanglante'—usually with amplification. It is an exercise of the schools, where the sixteenth-century pupil was taught to vary a given Latin sentence in as many ways as possible *styli exercendi gratia*. Both poets unquestionably felt genuine concern for their country in the Civil Wars, but then

⁷ Guy 1. 97; Ronsard 1. 292.

they doubtless had other strong feelings which they never expressed in their verses. It seemed proper to express this one in this way at the end of a book, because they had literary precedents; for Ronsard must have been prompted here by the well-known ending of Virgil's *Georgics*. Yet the French poets, one observes, in their situation, unlike Virgil felt no need of excusing their *studia ignobilis oti*; quite the contrary.

The sixteenth-century poets, for ever pillaging the same treasuries of themes, were well-broken to the ruses of style, and it was from invention in treatment more than from invention in subject that they looked to celebrate their triumphs. Hence it is instructive to follow a theme as it passes through different hands, as we have good opportunity to do in our next example of Guy's borrowing. We go therefore the long way round. A poet of the Anthology, Meleager of Gadara, is the author of some verses which may be translated as follows:⁸

O flower-nurtured bee, why do you brush Heliadora's skin, deserting the flowers of spring? Do you mean to show that she has that which is both sweet and false, the sting of love ever bitter to the heart? Yes, I think so—that is it. My friend go back where you came from: your message is no news to me.

Meleager's poem is not certainly, but very probably, the original of the *basium* of Joannes Secundus that we read next. Secundus invites the bees to leave the spring flowers and come to his lady's lips, but warns them of her 'sting.' This degree of transformation in an ancient theme is about what one learns to expect from the rhetorically-trained Latin poets of the Renaissance.⁹

Melliægæ volucres, quid adhuc thyma cana rosasque
Et rorem vernæ nectareum violæ
Lingitis aut florem late spirantis anethi?
Omnes ad dominae labra venite meae.
Illa rosas spirant omnes thymaque omnia sola
Et succum vernæ nectareum violæ.
Inde procul dulces auræ funduntur anethi,
Narcissi veris illa madent lacrimis
Oebaliæque madent iuvenis fragrante cruore,
Qualis uterque liquor, cum cecidisset, erat,

⁸ A. P. 5. 163. I follow here the text of the Planudean Anthology as read in the sixteenth century.

⁹ *Basia*, ed. by Ellinger, Berlin, 1899, p. 15. I have put vv. 5-12 in italics for reasons that will be apparent below.

*Nectareque aetherio medicatus, et aëre puro,
 Impleret fetu versicolore solum.*
 Sed me iure meo libantem mellea labra
 Ingratae socium ne prohibete favis.
 Non etiam totas avidae distendite cellas,
 Arescant dominae ne semel ora meae
 Basiaque impressans siccis sitientia labris,
 Garrulus indicii triste feram pretium.
 Heu non et stimulis compungite molle labellum:
 Ex oculis stimulos vibrat et illa pares.
 Credite, non ullum patietur vulnus inultum:
 Leniter innocuae mella legatis apes.

The poem is neatly arranged. After stating his theme in the first four lines, Secundus slows the motion and gives body to the piece by 'accumulation' in the floral passage of eight lines, and then finally exhibits his wit in three fancies addressed to the bees: (1) Do not exclude me from her lips, (2) Do not extract all the sweetness therefrom, and (3) Do not sting her, for she has stings equal to your own.

This was exactly the thing for the Pléiade. Ronsard turned it into an ode in 1550, Baïf into a long 'anacreontic' published in 1555, and Belleau into two sonnets in his *Bergerie* of 1565.¹⁰ Ronsard expresses the whole substance of Secundus' poem except that he omits point (1); his intention is fulfilled when he has transformed the Latin elegy into a graceful *chanson*, and has shown what he can do by way of invention in the floral passage, for, while crowding the points at the end, he has rehandled and augmented this passage, giving to it two out of his four stanzas. One sees that therein lies the main artistic interest of his poem. Baïf's treatment is characteristic of him: in some sixty lines he follows Secundus straight through, taking the floral passage more lightly (4 lines), but amplifying heavily on the three final points. Belleau's treatment is more interesting, since his opposite problem—compression of the material into sonnet-form—was more difficult:^{10a}

*Mouches qui massonez les voustes encirées
 De vos palais dorez, et qui dès le matin
 Volez de mont en mont pour effleurer le thym,*

¹⁰ Ronsard, *éd. crit.* by Laumonier, 2. 55; Baïf, *ed.* by Marty-Laveaux, 1. 260; Belleau, *ed.* by Gouverneur, 2. 280, 289.

^{10a} In Belleau's second sonnet, *Mais las! où volez-vous*, the theme is handled in a similar manner, but with a variation of language.

Et suçotter des fleurs les odeurs savourées:
 Dressez vos ailerons sur les lèvres sucrées
 De ma belle maistresse, et baisant son tetin
 Sur sa bouche pillez le plus riche butin
 Que vous chargeastes onc sur vos ailes dorées.
 Là trouverez un air embasmé de senteurs,
 Un lac comblé de miel, une moisson d'odeurs:
 Mais gardez-vous aussi des embusches cruelles.
 Car de sa bouche il sort un brasier allumé,
 Et de souspirs ardans un escadron armé,
 Et pour ce gardez-vous de n'y brusler vos ailes.

Slight as it is, this sonnet shows originality and thought. The floral passage is omitted, mainly no doubt as an unnecessary ornament, but possibly also because Belleau recalled that Ronsard had retained it as the chief 'effect' of his ode. Again, of Secundus' three final points, Belleau chooses only the last, that which gives warning of the lady's dangerous power, but he expresses it under the new figure of a brand and fiery sighs, not as in Secundus and Meleager by a 'sting.' Thereby the point: bee . . . sting . . . counter-sting, is lost, no doubt intentionally, because it would seem too clever and would 'steal' the whole sonnet, ruining the tone. In any case, a new point is welcome and shows the writer's wit.¹¹

¹¹ Similarly J. C. Scaliger, who paraphrases Secundus' poem in the form of an anacreontic (*Poemata*, Heidelberg, 1600, p. 457), also scants the floral passage, but makes the final point with *venena*. One may doubt whether this touches the true *decorum* of the theme better than 'sting' or 'brand'! Scaliger's *Anacreontica* appeared in 1574. An English version also comes to hand. At least I think it has not been noted that the verses of a madrigal by John Wilbye (publ. 1609), described by E. H. Fellowes as one of the most widely-known of all English madrigals, is a, probably direct, reduction of Secundus' poem (Fellowes, *English Madrigal School* 7 [1920]. 87, and compare *English Madrigal Composers*, Oxford, 1921, p. 212):

Sweet honey-sucking Bees, why do you still
 Surfeit on Roses, Pinks, and Violets,
 As if the choicest Nectar lay in them
 Wherewith you store your curious cabinets?
 Ah make your flight to Melisnaviae's lips;
 There may you revel in Ambrosian cheer,
 Where smiling Roses and sweet Lilies sit
 Keeping their spring-tide graces all the year.
 Yet, sweet, take heed, all sweets are hard to get;
 Sting not her soft lips, Oh beware of that!
 For if one flaming dart come from her eye
 Was never dart so sharp, ah then you die!

What remained for Guy to do in rehandling this theme? We have seen him transposing sonnets of Ronsard; on this occasion he revises Belleau, as is clear, for example, from his final point, where 'brandon' is from Belleau's 'brasier':¹²

Fille du ciel, O menagere Avette,
Ne lasse plus tes vollans avirons
Pour effleurer à petits becs larrons
Les belles fleurs qui naissent sur Hymette.
Sans te peiner d'une aussi longue traite,
Sur ceste bouche ou bien aux environs,
Tu peux sugger un milier de fleurons,
Mainte Hyacinthe et mainte Paquerette.
Icy la fleur qui naquit d'Adonis
Croist à foison, ici sont épanis
Les lyz, les tymes et le Girofle encore;
Mais garde toy, déroband leur douceur
Pour t'enrichir, qu' un brandon ravisseur
Ainsi qu' à moy le cœur ne te devore.

He has lightened the sonnet by reducing Belleau's twelve-syllable lines to the more common ten-syllable measure; but his main intention is clear: he thought that Belleau had erred in omitting the floral passage, and hence he restores it, neatly enough, in his version.¹³ There is no reason, however, to suppose that Guy knew the original *basium* of Secundus. Rather, we have here another instance of his loyalty to Ronsard, from whose ode he very likely imagined Belleau's sonnet to have been made; for that Guy had Ronsard in mind is evident, since, true to his habits, he has lifted the address, 'Fille du ciel,' directly from Ronsard's first line.¹⁴

¹² Guy, *ed. cit.* 1. 33: the sixth sonnet, 'La Bouche,' in a series entitled 'Pourtrait de son Ente.' The phrase, 'à petits becs larrons,' is taken from Belleau's second sonnet.

¹³ Yet the *brandon* certainly arises somewhat abruptly out of Guy's bouquet of flowers—another reason, perhaps a principal one, why Belleau had been obliged to suppress the floral passage.

¹⁴ Few sixteenth-century 'floral passages' fail to include the flowers mythologically sprung from men. Secundus gives us Narcissus and Hyacinthus (vv. 8-9), and Ronsard, Hyacinthus and Ajax, replacing Narcissus by Ajax because of his bracket, 'fleurettes ensanglantées.' Secundus had similarly bracketed Narcissus and Hyacinthus, but by an undesirable pun that Ronsard was unwilling to reproduce: 'Qualis uterque liquor, cum cecidisset, erat.' Guy in an effort to vary the language of Ronsard takes virtually the only metamorphosed mortal left under 'fleurettes ensanglantées,' namely Adonis.

From all this we get some idea of Guy's artistic personality. He is no bewildered imitator; whether he appropriates a phrase or a line from another, or re-works an entire sonnet, he proceeds deliberately, with some purpose; but his purposes, it seems, amount to little. We should be unjust, however, in this last instance to measure the superiority of Belleau by comparing the small differential between the two French sonnets with the large differential between Belleau and Secundus. We ought to know what Guy could do in making a sonnet from a comparable Latin poem. Such knowledge fortunately is at hand. Like so many sixteenth-century poets Guy has drawn a handful of his poems from the *Erotopaegnion* of Girolamo Angeriano. I summarize these borrowings:¹⁵

Guy de Tours	Angeriano
Mon Anne et Cupidon (1.61)	Caelia fatur, Amor (a4)
Le premier qui peignit (1.69)	In tabula primus (e4)
Mon Anne voyant (1.70)	Forte videns natum (e3)
Mon Anne trouvant (1.71)	Quum dormiret Amor (b2)
Pourquoy te myres-tu (1.74)	Quid speculum spectas (e4)
Lorsqu' un petit papillon (1.84)	Papilio fulgens (c4)
Mon Anne un jour (1.85)	Pectine formosos (c4)
Bien-heureuse tu chante (1.87)	Tu felix cantas (c4)
A cause que ta beauté (1.88)	Ecce tumet forma (d1)
Lorsqu' une fievre (1.93)	Quum mea ferventi (e2)

These ten poems from the Latin of Angeriano are all found in the third book of Guy's *Souspirs*. Only the first and the last are sonnets, the remainder taking the form of anacreontic odes or *chansons*, except *Le premier qui peignit*, which is a poem in six quatrains, and *Pourquoy te myres-tu*, which is a single quatrain. Hence in most instances he has chosen a metrical form that imposes no restraint, but permits him to follow his originals with little modification. The first of the two sonnets, again, is made from an epigram that happens to contain just enough material to fill the sonnet-form. But in making the second sonnet he was faced with a problem of reduction comparable with that faced by Belleau in dealing with Secundus.

De Caelia Convalescente

Quum mea ferventi langueret febre puella,
Purpureo et starent candida membra toro,

¹⁵ References are to Guy, *ed. cit.*, and to Angeriano, *Erotopaegnion*, Naples, 1520.

Induit invisum Mors lurida protinus ensem,
 Et petit infestis aurea tecta rogis.
 Irruit, at postquam vidit sine labe papillas,
 Et quales praefert flava Minerva oculos,
 Obrigit retroque dedit vestigia, et inquit:
 Non haec lethaeam digna subire ratem.
 Sic fata infernas pudibunda recessit ad umbras,
 Ausaque sic nigro verba tonare Jovi:
 Quaecumque aetherio sub regno regna morantur
 Sunt nostra, una precor Caelia morte vacet.
 Annuit hoc Pluto, facta est dea, et illico cedunt
 Nubila, et intonsus dat quoque Phoebus opem.
 Sperandum est, postquam Mors importuna pepercit,
 Facta dea ut nostras audiat illa preces.

Lorsqu' une fièvre forte agitoit ma Maistresse,
 La Mort vint à son lit, recrespant de sa main
 Le bois souplement fort de son dard inhumain,
 Afin de la tuer au fort de son angoisse.
 Mais si tost qu'elle vist la fleur de sa jeunesse
 Et le mont jumelet de son trop chaste sein,
 Elle ne voulut pas achever son dessein,
 Et sans luy faire mal, incontinent la laisse.
 Et disoit s'en allant: Une telle beauté
 Ne doit jamais sentir ma fiere cruauté,
 Ny morte devaller au manoir Plutonique.
 Les enfers ne sont pas dignes de tel honneur;
 Apres cent ans d'icy, sans mort et sans douleur,
 Le ciel s'enrichira de sa face angelique.

In setting up the situation Guy (vv. 1-8) follows the original closely (vv. 1-7), but thereafter sacrifices the action (withdrawal of Death to Hades, her plea to Pluto, transformation of Caelia into an immortal goddess), and makes the rest of his sonnet merely a laudatory speech by Death, of which vv. 9-12 are no more than varied statements of v. 8 in Angeriano. The final point is thereby lost; Guy's 'After living a hundred years, without death she will become an angel in heaven,' seems much inferior to Angeriano's 'It is to be hoped that now, having become a goddess, she will hear our prayers.' Yet there is something to be said for Guy. Angeriano's poem, though rather long, is properly an epigram, and hence justifies a somewhat complex narrative by a striking point at the end. Though the sixteenth-century sonnet had been sufficiently crossed by the classical and neo-Latin epigram to make it seek something like the epigrammatic final point, it retained its

true lyric nature so far as to keep these points subdued. Belleau seems to respond to this feeling in his transformation of Secundus' final points. The sonnet had to remain 'passionate,' and too smart a conclusion would tend to throw it from the emotional climate of love-poetry completely into the intellectual climate of wit. Perhaps therefore Guy does well enough to sacrifice the point of his original, and, naturally, the complex narrative that leads to it and is in any case too complex for a sonnet; but it is hard to escape the impression that he has impoverished his borrowed theme far more than Belleau, in Guy's estimation, impoverished his by omitting the floral ornament.¹⁶

JAMES HUTTON

Cornell University

LES LETTRES DE VOLTAIRE DES MANUSCRITS TRONCHIN

Georges Bengesco, dans sa *Bibliographie*,¹ s'étonne de trouver des différences assez considérables entre les lettres de Voltaire aux Tronchin publiées par Gaullieur² et le texte de Cayrol et François³ reproduit plus tard par Louis Moland.⁴

Evidemment, il y a eu, d'un côté ou de l'autre, négligence, inattention, manque d'exactitude ou de précision, de scrupule. Est-ce M. Gaullieur qui, en dépouillant la correspondance autographe de Voltaire avec les Tronchin, a fondu en une seule et même lettre plusieurs billets distincts, plusieurs missives séparées? Sont-ce MM. de Cayrol et François qui ont morcelé à l'infini cette correspondance? . . .⁵

¹⁶ The poems here noticed are, of course, only a small portion of Guy's production. I have observed only two other borrowings: an elegy entitled *Songe* (1. 52) from Ovid, *Amores* 1. 5, quite literally translated save that it is cast as a dream and sixteen rather empty verses are added at the end; and secondly an epigram, *A Pacollet* (2. 77), reproducing Buchanan's well-known *In Zoilum* (*Poemata*, Leiden: Elzevir, 1628, p. 329).

¹ G. Bengesco, *Voltaire. Bibliographie de ses oeuvres* (Paris, Rouvère et Perrin, 1882-1890, 4 vol.) III, 237.

² Henri-Eusèbe Gaullieur, *Revue suisse*, mai, juin, juillet, août et septembre 1855.

³ Cayrol et François, *Lettres inédites de Voltaire*, Paris, Didier, 1856, 2 volumes.

⁴ *Oeuvres complètes de Voltaire*, Paris, Garnier frères, 1880-1883, 52 volumes.

⁵ G. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, 237.

Les manuscrits originaux des lettres de Voltaire aux Tronchin sont maintenant accessibles et permettent de répondre à cette question. Jetons d'abord un coup d'œil sur leur histoire.

En septembre 1778, quatre mois après la mort de Voltaire, Panckoucke préparait déjà une édition de sa correspondance générale et il chargea le marquis de Florian de rassembler les lettres qui se trouvaient aux mains de Genevois. Le marquis s'adressa donc à François Tronchin :

. . . Je sais que vous vous intéressez comme moi à la gloire de M. de Voltaire, et j'espère que vous ne serez pas fâché de l'augmenter et d'y concourir. Si donc vous aviez de ses lettres, vous obligeriez infiniment M. Panckoucke et moi-même, si vous vouliez les lui communiquer, soit en original, soit par copie. Je crois être sûr que M. Tronchin-Boissier doit en avoir; si j'étais plus en relations avec lui, je prendrais la liberté de les lui demander. Ne l'osant pas, voudriez vous avoir la bonté de le faire? . . .⁶

Cette lettre fut annotée ainsi par celui auquel elle était adressée :

Ma réponse à M. de Florian, du même jour, 28 septembre 1778, a été qu'une correspondance particulière ne pouvait passer au public sans l'agrément de l'auteur des lettres qui me sont demandées, et que nous ne sommes malheureusement plus à temps de consulter.⁷

Les Tronchin, comme le remarque Gaullieur,

étaient gens d'affaires aussi bien que gens d'éducation. Ils voyaient dans Voltaire le capitaliste et le spéculateur, le gentilhomme de la chambre du roi de France et l'ancien chambellan du roi de Prusse, tout autant, si ce n'est plus, que le poète et le philosophe. Ils ne se souciaient nullement, pour mille motifs de discrétion, de convenance ou de prudence, de voir leur nom imprimé à côté de celui de leur hôte. La publicité n'était pas leur affaire.⁸

L'édition de Kehl, en 1785, ne donne pas une seule lettre de Voltaire aux membres de leur famille. L'édition des *Œuvres Complètes* de 1876⁹ n'a que trois lettres de ce fonds (à Théodore Tronchin, 18 avril 1756; à Tronchin-Calendrin, 13 novembre 1765; à François Tronchin, 1er décembre 1771). Elle n'en contient pas une seule qui soit adressée à Jean-Robert Tronchin, son banquier,

⁶ Florian à François Tronchin, 28 septembre 1778. Lettre publiée par Gaullieur, *Revue suisse*, 1855, 271-272. Il ne s'agit pas de Florian le fabuliste, comme le dit Gaullieur, mais de son oncle, qui avait épousé la nièce de Voltaire.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 272.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 271.

⁹ Voltaire, *Œuvres Complètes*, Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1876.

à qui il semble bien pourtant que Voltaire ait écrit plus fréquemment qu'à tout autre de ses correspondants, entre 1755 et 1762, sans excepter d'Argental.

En 1855, Gaullieur publia dans la *Revue suisse*¹⁰ un certain nombre de lettres provenant des archives de la famille Tronchin. Elles parurent en volume la même année.¹¹ Avec quelques modifications dont nous reparlerons, elles furent publiées de nouveau par Cayrol et François en 1856¹² et ont été reproduites depuis dans l'édition Moland des *Œuvres Complètes de Voltaire*.¹³

Mais ces lettres "sont loin de constituer l'ensemble de la correspondance entre le patriarche et ses amis de Genève," avertissait Bengesco,¹⁴ faisant allusion aux inédits de la famille Tronchin. Et Desnoiresterres nous apprend de son côté qu'il s'efforça d'obtenir accès à ces archives et qu'il eut l'occasion d'y jeter un coup d'œil.

Ce dépôt si fermé s'est ouvert un instant; il existe, et nous l'avons palpé, un ensemble de lettres autographes ne formant pas moins de 7 volumes, qu'on se refuse, avec une obstination qu'il faut respecter, à laisser publier.¹⁵

Ces volumes de lettres autographes (qui sont au nombre de dix: Fonds Tronchin, A 86, A 87, A 88, A 89, A 90, A 91, A 92, A 93, A 94, A 95) appartiennent depuis 1937 à la Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire de Genève. MM. Delarue, bibliothécaire en chef et Fernand Aubert, conservateur des manuscrits, ont bien voulu, au début de 1940, nous autoriser à en prendre copie.

Ils contiennent 597 lettres de Voltaire (dont 572 aux Tronchin), 59 de Mme Denis et une cinquantaine d'autres qui leur sont adressées. Pour ne parler que des lettres de Voltaire aux Tronchin, 267 d'entre elles, soit, en gros, près de la moitié, ont déjà été publiées, soit dans les volumes de Moland, soit dans les volumes d'Henri Tronchin.¹⁶ Moland donne 158 lettres de Voltaire aux Tronchin (96 à Jean-Robert Tronchin, 23 à François Tronchin, 37 à Théo-

¹⁰ *Revue suisse*, 1855.

¹¹ H.-E. Gaullieur, *Mélanges historiques et littéraires sur la Suisse française*, Paris et Genève, Cherbulliez, 1855.

¹² Cayrol et François, *op. cit.*

¹³ *Op. cit.*, vol. XXXVIII à L.

¹⁴ G. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, III, 236.

¹⁵ G. Desnoiresterres, *Voltaire et la société française au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, Didier, 1871-1876, 8 volumes) VIII, 450, note 1.

¹⁶ Henri Tronchin, *Le Conseiller François Tronchin et ses amis*, Paris, Plon, 1895. *Un médecin au XVIII^e siècle. Théodore Tronchin*, Paris, Plon, 1906.

dore Tronchin, 2 à Jacob Tronchin). De ce nombre, 46 ne se retrouvent pas dans les manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire de Genève. Restent 112 lettres qui sont à la fois dans les manuscrits et dans l'édition Moland. Il n'est pas sans intérêt de les comparer.

Douze lettres sont reproduites entièrement dans Moland, ou presque entièrement (Mol. 2897, 3115, 3158, 3434, 3481, 3483, 5340, 5711, 8911, 8926, 8927, 10050), bien que parfois mal datées (Mol. 5340, 19 juillet 1763: il faut 19 juillet 1764; 8927, 9 septembre 1773: il faut 31 août 1773; 10050, 7 septembre 1777: il faut 7 septembre 1776).

Quinze autres sont conformes au texte original pour les deux tiers ou davantage (Mol. 3065, 3281, 3290, 3306, 3408, 3451, 3468, 3475, 3490, 3495, 3504, 3528, 3685, 3964, 8420). La lettre 3290 du 15 janvier 1757 substitue *bigots* à *prêtres* (Mss "mais je crains les prêtres") et les dix lignes qui suivent ne sont pas du 15 janvier 1757; elles font partie, dans les manuscrits, d'une lettre du 27 janvier 1757.

Les quatre-vingt cinq autres lettres sont ou des fragments simples, ou d'étranges conglomerats groupant sous une seule date des phrases provenant de diverses lettres qui, dans les manuscrits originaux, couvrent un espace de plusieurs mois ou même de plusieurs années et ont parfois différents destinataires.

La formation de ces conglomerats reste mystérieuse. Moland s'est borné à reproduire Cayrol et François. Ces derniers paraissent avoir su que le texte de Gaullieur était douteux et se sont efforcés d'y remédier. Bengesco a constaté^{10a} que telle lettre de l'édition Gaullieur (Voltaire à Jean-Robert Tronchin, 23 décembre 1758) forme, dans le volume de Cayrol et François comme dans l'édition Moland, cinq lettres distinctes (Moland 3716, 3725, 3781, 3837, 3844), dont trois sont adressées à Jean-Robert Tronchin et deux à son frère François. Mais la comparaison avec le texte original montre que ces tentatives pour fragmenter les énormes poudingues légués par Gaullieur procédaient à tâtons; tantôt elles sont allées trop loin et ont mis sous plusieurs dates ce qui provient d'une seule des lettres autographes; tantôt elles ont laissé groupés des passages de plusieurs provenances. Si nous suivons le sort des cinq lettres mentionnées ci-dessus par Bengesco, nous voyons que Moland 3837 est composé à son tour d'extraits de deux lettres des manuscrits,

^{10a} G. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, III, 237.

et Moland 3781, d'extraits de trois lettres. Les huit lettres originales enfin ne sont reproduites qu'en partie: Moland 3716 (13 décembre 1758): 31 lignes sur 65; 3725 (22 décembre 1758): 9 lignes sur 22; 3781 (17 février 1759): a) 17 février 1759, 13 lignes sur 26; b) 26 février 1759, 9 lignes sur 15; c) 26 mars 1759, 2 lignes sur 16; 3837 (2 mai 1759): a) 11 avril 1759, 3 lignes sur 27; b) 2 mai 1759, 9 lignes sur 50; 3844 (7 mai 1759): 9 lignes sur 73.

Dans d'autres cas, ce ne sont pas seulement deux ou trois fragments différents qui entrent dans une seule des lettres de l'édition Moland, mais jusqu'à huit ou dix. Comment expliquer ce procédé? J'ai entendu dire à Genève que Gaullieur ne fut pas autorisé par la famille Tronchin à copier les manuscrits directement; il aurait reçu copie des textes qu'on jugeait dignes d'être publiés. D'ailleurs peu importe. Quel que soit l'auteur de ces découpages, son idée directive paraît avoir été d'émonder du texte les menus détails de la vie domestique de Voltaire pour relever principalement les événements célèbres de son existence et les mentions de faits historiques, —nouvelles de la Guerre de Sept Ans, lutte des Parlements, échos de Versailles. Le découpeur a eu tort, sans doute, tout comme les premiers éditeurs des *Pensées*, de ne pas se conformer d'avance à ce qu'exigeraient les méthodes d'histoire littéraire de notre temps; il a eu surtout le tort inexplicable de copier si bizarrement ce qu'il a copié. Telle lettre, datée du 19 septembre 1761 dans Moland (4684), est une mosaïque d'une douzaine de fragments de sept dates différentes, où pas une phrase sur dix n'est sans quelque inexactitude, petite ou grosse. Nous la transcrivons ci-dessous. C'est un cas bien accusé, mais nullement exceptionnel, qui peut servir comme exemple des lettres de Voltaire aux Tronchin fabriquées par procédé synthétique. Nous avons d'autre part donné plus haut la liste des lettres publiées dans Moland d'une façon à peu près exacte.

Moland 4684

A M. Tronchin, de Lyon.

19 septembre 1761.

J'ai donc chez moi Mlle Chimène et Rodogune. [L'emploi des coupons et d'une somme d'argent égale sera un bien petit objet, et je n'oserais¹⁷ pas mettre si peu de chose sur la tête de la parente de Corneille. Mais puisque vous croyez la chose convenable, on peut toujours lui faire ce léger avan-

¹⁷ MS: . . . "je n'osais . . ." 19 décembre 1761.

tage.¹⁸ Ainsi les faiseurs joindront le nom de Corneille à celui de Voltaire.] (MS Fonds Tronchin, recueil A 94, 19 décembre 1761). Mais j'ai entrepris autre chose. Je veux faire une édition de Pierre Corneille en faveur de sa petite-fille. C'est une [entreprise qui ne laisse pas d'être une affaire de finance un peu délicate.]¹⁹ (MS, 14 août 1761). [Il faudra que je fasse les avances de l'édition. Cela ira à 40.000 livres. Les vers sont un objet de commerce plus gros qu'on ne pense.]²⁰ (MS, 7 septembre 1761). [J'espère en venir à bout avec le secours des bontés du roi, qui daigne donner 10.000 livres,¹⁹ (MS, 14 août 1761) soit [la valeur de deux cents exemplaires. Tous les princes ont suivi cet exemple. M. de Richelieu en prend vingt; M. le duc de Choiseul, vingt, etc., etc. M. Bertin, contrôleur général, est le seul à la cour qui ne s'intéresse pas aux souscriptions que je fais faire. Il ne m'a pas seulement répondu.]²¹ (MS, 7 août 1761). [Mais il faudra bien que ce contrôleur-là paye les souscriptions royales, et le temps n'est pas des plus favorables.]²⁰ (MS, 14 août 1761). [Si Dieu nous donnait la paix, cette édition de Corneille serait une fortune pour Mlle Corneille; mais elle me paraît bien éloignée.]²⁰ (MS, 7 septembre 1761). [Ils ont dit: *La paix! la paix!* et il n'y a²² point de paix. Et ce fou de Diogène Rousseau propose la paix perpétuelle.] (MS, 19 mars 1761). [Nous ne pouvons faire que la paix la plus humiliante ou la guerre la plus ruineuse. Mille familles sont ruinées.] (MS, 7 août 1761). [Il est vrai que je bâtis, que je fais des jardins, que je joue la comédie.²³ Mais je suis sage, j'entamerai

¹⁸ MS: . . . "ce léger avantage sans préjudice de ce qu'on doit faire pour elle, et madame denis a qui j'en ay parlé approuve beaucoup cette disposition. ainsi les faiseurs joindront le nom de corneille a celui de voltaire, et me feront sans doute trop d'honneur . . ." 19 décembre 1761.

¹⁹ MS: . . . "mon entreprise de l'Edition de Corneille ne laisse pas d'être une affaire de finance un peu délicate. j'espère en venir à bout avec le secours des bontés du Roy qui daigne donner dix mille Livres. mais il faudra que Mr. le controlleur general les paye, et le temps n'est pas des plus favorables . . ." 14 août 1761.

²⁰ MS: . . . "il y a bien autre chose, il faudra que je fasse les avances de l'edition de corneille. cela ira a 40000 livres. les vers sont un objet de commerce plus gros qu'on ne pense. il n'y a rien a perdre a ces avances; et ces 40000 livres se payeront a plusieurs termes.

si dieu nous donnait la paix l'edition de Corneille serait une fortune pour melle corneille. mais cette paix me paraît bien éloignée." 7 septembre 1761.

²¹ MS: . . . "A propos, je ne suis pas extrêmement content de Mr. le controlleur general, il est le seul à la cour qui ne s'intéresse pas aux souscriptions que je fais faire pour une Edition de Pierre Corneille, en faveur de sa petite-fille. Le Roy prend la valeur de deux cent exemplaires; tous les princes ont suivi cet exemple, Mr. de Richelieu en prend vingt, mr. le Duc de Choiseul vingt etc. Mr. Bertin ne m'a pas seulement répondu . . ." 7 août 1761.

²² MS: . . . "il n'y avait . . ." 19 mars 1761.

²³ MS: . . . "la comédie, que j'ay quelque fois cent cinquante bouches à nourrir et toujours cent. mais je suis sage . . ." 13 octobre 1760.

les fonds le moins que je pourrai.²⁴ Les châteaux et les comédies sont chers.] (MS, 13 octobre 1760). [Mme Denis veut un²⁵ théâtre, et moi, une belle église. Nous irons tous à l'hôpital entre Jésus-Christ et Corneille.] (MS, 2 septembre 1761).

ANDRÉ DELATRE

Wayne University

JOHANN SALOMON SEMLER'S GEDANKEN VON
ÜBEREINKOMMUNG DER ROMANE MIT
DEN LEGENDEN, HALLE 1749

Semler's programme, meant as a Christmas gift for the Saxe-Weimar Councillor Samuel Lenz, appeared in Halle "bey Johann Justinus Gebauer," 24 pp. in-4. The title page has a motto: "Pour faire un livre, qui ait du debit, il faut travailler à des Romans. Lettres de M. Bayle." The second sheet contains the dedication to Lenz, the third a preface directed to the same. Among other remarks, the following is of interest: "Was den Inhalt dieser Blätter betrifft, so habe vermeinet, Gelegenheit zu manchen nicht unnützlichen Betrachtungen zu geben, wenn ich einen Einfal, den ich in einer französischen Zeitung einmal gelesen, weiter verfolgte. Ich werde glauben einigen Nutzen gestiftet zu haben, wenn sich diese Gedanken einigen Unwillen und Verachtung, des blossen Gegenstandes wegen, zuziehen solten." This gives us a source on the one hand and, on the other, an insight into Semler's character such as it revealed itself in later years gradually and most influentially: Semler was the born historian who would apply historical views to anything, be it novels, the middle ages, or even the origin of the biblical collections. If *die Aufklärung* was unhistorical, Semler whom the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek* considers one of the leaders of Enlightenment, did not belong to *that Aufklärung*. On p. 7, he begins with a half-humorous revaluation of mediævalism and the catholic monk: "Wenn die Geschlechtsforscher oder Erdbeschreiber ohngefähr in den Klosterreliquien blättern, und das nicht finden, was sie ohnfehlbar vermutet haben: so müssen diese guten Platköpfe bey der Unordnung und dem Unverstand zu Hause gehören." He criticizes even Gronov, Græve, Maffei, Burman,

²⁴ MS: . . . "que je pourrai." Dix lignes plus bas: . . . "les châteaux et les comédies sont chers." 13 octobre 1760.

²⁵ MS: . . . "veut un beau théâtre . . ." 2 septembre 1761.

Facciolati, the cream of critics and philologists, for their unhistorical view of monasticism, and asks himself if it really matters when pure Latin style is neglected. "Die Mönche haben durch eigenmächtige Vermerung der *lateinischen* Sprache reichlich ersetzt, was der natürlichen Reinigkeit durch ihre eigne Nachlässigkeit abging." His casualness of style is by no means to be misinterpreted as of solely ironical intent; Semler merely wishes to write in such light vein as would become a Christmas gift to a cavalier; but he is also serious; he himself never wrote elegant Latin; and he refers to his early essay, when thirty years later he has to justify his character in the light of his own development as a scholar and historian, in *Semlers Lebensbeschreibung von ihm selbst abgefasst*.¹ His complicated theoretical character lent itself to misunderstanding; his impartiality and equal justice that never could see the wrong in one side only, his historical attitude that did not even look for good or bad, but was satisfied with understanding, found itself in a difficult impasse when confronted with decisions, such as Dr. Bahrdt's case had required. The frantic attempt to move away from that unhappy man and scholar, who after all had but more courage and character than the great historian Semler, ended with this *Lebensbeschreibung*, which does not excuse its author, though it interprets him adequately.—Here we find as the central figure the learned polyhistor Baumgarten, whose *Nachrichten* were compiled by such men as Semler. Among the sources he mentions Bayle's *Nouvelles de la république des lettres*, *Journal des scavans*, LeClerc's *Bibliothèques*, *La nouvelle bibliothèque germanique* and others.² Any of these might have given the first hint to Semler's treatise on the novel. Apart from a Munich Dissertation, 1911,³ we have no adequate discussion of early novel theory, nor is Wolff really adequate. Semler, at any rate, has not been discussed from this angle as yet, although his name is mentioned quite often in some general connection or other.

While the older novel theory attempts to find norms such as Aristotle is supposed to have established for other genres; the fact that prose fiction and prose writing, *history* and *story*, especially the so-called *True Story*, for which antiquity offered amusing

¹ Halle 1781 f. i, 115.

² *Ibid.* i, 114; ii, 21.

³ Max L. Wolff, *Geschichte der Romantheorie*, Nürnberg 1915; vgl. *Reall. d. d. Lg.* iii, 63.

examples of untruthfulness, could not be readily distinguished on principle was the main impediment in novel theory. While one had novels with various degrees of direct or hidden factualness, from the *Astrée* or *Argenis* to *Arminius*, the degree of fictionalism could not be sufficiently separated from the aspect of symbolic truth—"even if *Arminius* spoke differently, people *do* speak like *Arminius*." The *Acta Eruditorum*, for example, again and again are concerned with these questions.⁴ From the historical angle, all the stately journals of scholars, such as Breitingen's *Tempe Helveticum* or Mencken's *Miscellanea Lipsiensia (nova)*, of which I have the copy which Gottsched once owned, contribute occasional information; but a theologian was not apt to enter on the scene. Semler, of course, was fundamentally a historian who applied the methods of critical research to the Bible more subtly even than Capelle and Simon, LeClerc and Pfaff; but his autobiography recalls to our mind a story Woodrow Wilson and Stockton Axson used to tell upon a visit to Max Müller's house—there was no retreat, none whatsoever, where there were not books; and Semler tells us what he used to read on certain occasions—mystics, fairy tales, magic, and the like. No wonder that he should see at an early age that those legendary reports that became canonised as Bible would have to be taken together with other miracle stories that did not happen to become part of the Western Canon. In this manner, his essay on novel and legend is, in a manner, part of his later research!

The essay consists of fifteen whimsical paragraphs: In the first, he says: "Die meisten heiligen Geschichten kommen ihrer ganzen Abfassung und Vorstellung nach, von müszigen und gutmeinenden Urhebern her." While this refers specifically to legends of Saints rather than biblical stories, he finds considerable similarity with novelists, *Memoiressteller*, etc. The second paragraph jokes about *Ausschmückung*, both in legends and novels, exclamations, flowery hyperbolæ, the use of imaginary foreign, especially Oriental, languages. 3. Similarity of content: practically all saints are identical; so are the heroes of practically all novels, even if new names are found. As the saints are all very pious, severe, abstaining, martyrs, workers of miracles, etc., all novels deal with the tribulations of lovers. Semler's description of the "gemeine Roman" follows the

⁴ 1683, p. 147 Bucher on history; p. 385 Huet on novels. 1684, p. 433 Mrs. Prash on novels. 1688, p. 226 A. Ch. Rothe on fiction. 1689, p. 287 *Arminius* by Lohenstein. p. 633 Bartholinus and Huet on the *Edda*.

pattern of the Greek novel that, through Longus, Heliodor, and Chariton, had entered the seventeenth century novel of Europe. Semler jokes about his concept of "Einheit," referring to the *Querelle* between de la Motte and Mme Dacier, who need not have proved the "unity" of the *Iliad*. 4. *Hauptabsicht*: Semler smilingly maintains that edification is the ultimate purpose of both Saintly and Love stories. Virtue is bound to win. 5. As the Saint had nothing to do but to effect miracles, the hero of the novel need do nothing but marry, um "ein Fräulein, eine Prinzessin, eine Nonne, eine Indianerin, eine Morin, eine Slavine in den glücklichsten Zustand auf der Welt zu setzen." 6. The readers of either type are alike, people of limited intelligence and much leisure. "Dis einige bleibt allen gleich übrig, dasz sich ein jeder zu Hause gar bequem über die greulichen Tücke des Glücks in der Stube erbossen kan." 7. Other books are becoming less important; the novel can replace the bible. 8. The taste for legends of saints and novels derives from "Unwissenheit der wahren Geschichte." "Es sind viele, so die *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Malte*, . . . und andere wirkliche Romanen, für wahre Geschichten halten." 9. The international character of legend and novel, to which he also alluded sub 6, is exemplified by the traffic in translations. 10. On the business aspect, writer, publisher, salesman. 11. On old models and copper-plate nudities. 12. The growing popularity at certain times, such as since Mlle. de Scudéry the novel has experienced, is paralleled to the ups and downs of Saints' legends. 13. Improvements of legends by Bolland, Baillet and others are compared with improvements of the novel by D'Argens, de Scudéry, Prévost d'Exiles, d'Urfé and others, whose works, distinguishable among each other, greatly differ from the common love novel. The *Astrée* is called beautiful, and the *Mémoires d'un homme de qualité* are preferred to *Manon Lescaut*; but when he calls the *Arabian Nights*, *Amadis*, the *Banise* and *Herkules* indispensable for passing the time, his satirical vein gets again the better of him. 14. Scholars can make use of them: There is a somewhat shady story about the history of paper, taken from a legend by St. Petrus Damianus, to prove how legends may be used by scholars. Similarly with the novel: "Daß Rabelais für Gelerte sey, wird wol niemand leugnen; wenigstens haben die gewöhnlichen Romanleser keine Lust daran." Next he mentions *Automathes* by Kirkby and Pococke's *Philosophus autodidactus*. 15. On Defenders: There is an array of strange

defenses ("Mabillon hat sich der Thräne Christi zu Vendome männlich angenommen, wider des satirischen Thiers ungläubige Angriffe."), and with similar success the novels have been defended: "ob gleich der Abt von S. Real, und nach ihm Lenglet der wahren Geschichte vor den Romanen einen grossen Vorzug beilegen wollen: so ist doch leicht zu begreifen, daß der Verfasser der Schrift *de l'usage des Romans* mehr Leser findet, und mehrere überzeuget." The young scholar, in his twenty-eighth year of age, expects however that he will be despised and contradicted for his low opinion of fiction: "Ich mus es leiden, wenn einige dieses für einen Versuch in der Satire erklären wollen; wenn man mich nur dadurch nicht zu schimpfen meinet. Ich würde mich aber auch sehr freuen, wenn ich Personen, die zu was besserm aufgelegt sind, etwas irre machen, und dazu bringen könnte, daß sie die Romane so lange liegen liessen, bis sie in der wahren ältern oder neuern Geschichte etwas versucht hätten." The remaining four pages call for historical studies, into which he gives an introduction, while berating some more fiction writers, especially the author of *Gespräche im Reiche der Todten*. If the readers knew "ihren schlechten Verfasser" they would not be proud of owning the entire collection: "Buddei so genantes historisches Lexicon, war die Qvelle, woraus er am meisten schöpfte; welche er nicht einmal selbst besas, sondern gemeiniglich die ersten Tage jedes Monats so lange lernte, bis er mit einer neuen *Entrevue* sein nötiges Weingeld verdienet hatte." Poor Faßmann! Semler simply is no good when he is serious; or is he: "Arnolds *Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie* setzt einen leicht in den Stand, wider die Geistlichen bey Gelegenheit mit Nachdruck aus der Geschichte loszuziehen. Herrn von Holbergs *Kirchengeschichte* gibt auch erhebliche Betrachtungen an die Hand: zumal wenn er Baylens Namenbuch in gewissen Artikeln von Wort zu Wort, auch mit den eingeschalteten Dichtersprüchen und *bons mots* abgeschrieben hat." He concludes, nevertheless, by stating that usefulness should not be the proof of history, nor should one think that the facts are as yet available. With growing research, history might have so many unknown names and so many precise data that it would resemble our novels.

This half jocular, half serious essay is an interesting contribution to the great historian's biography; the theorist of fiction will place it next to the *Réflexions sur les Romans*, which the wife of burgo-master Prasch published in 1684 in answer to bishop Huet's appraisal and approval. As long as novels were seen as imperfect

history—untrue reading when so much real history would be available—no adequate theory could be developed. From the point of view of historiography, however, both Semler's serious work and this rare *programma* deserve more consideration. Though Semler never acquired the gift of presenting a topic in a form intelligible to his average contemporaries, his effect on church and laity was enormous, and for lasting success he should only have followed the precepts of Rapin's *Instructions pour l'histoire*, Paris 1677; for the Jesuit poet Rapin looked at history as literature with an eye for style just as the Lutheran scholar Semler looked at literature as would-be history with an eye for truths and inventions.

HEINRICH MEYER

Formerly at Rice Institute

GRETE'S BAD NAME

The name *Grete* has long been in bad odor, longer indeed than anyone seems to have stopped to point out.¹ Professor J. A. Walz's comments on a sixteenth-century Faust play supported this interpretation, and he had no occasion to look farther. Friedrich Zarncke, who incidentally pointed out these implications, declared that they were particularly frequent in Northern Germany and appeared in Upper Germany after the Reformation. As supporting evidence he cites "Als im der todt genommen het/ Euridicen sein schöne Gredt" from Sebastian Brant's *Freidank* of 1538. In the *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Arthur Hübner collects a good number of examples, and more may be found in Othmar Meisinger's very interesting discussion of the connotations of Christian names in the Upper German dialects.

Zarncke's belief that this use of *Grete* is characteristically Northern German—a use for which he gives no examples—is erroneous.

¹ I have commented on it in *Problems in German Literary History of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (New York, 1939), pp. 113-14, n. 98, citing J. A. Walz, "A German Faust Play of the Sixteenth Century," *Germanic Review*, III (1928), 11-12; F. Zarncke (ed.), *Sebastian Brants Narrenschiff* (Leipzig, 1854), p. 300. See further *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, IV, i, 6, cols. 198-200; O. Meisinger, "Die weiblichen Appellativnamen in den hochdeutschen Mundarten," *Zeitschrift für hochdeutsche Mundarten*, VI (1905), 88-89, No. 23. J. C. Dolz, *Die Moden in den Taufnamen* (Leipzig, 1825) offers nothing pertinent.

To be sure, he may have in mind various Northern German uses of Grete for a demon of one sort or another, but such uses do not stand very close to the pejorative connotation of Grete. Oswald von Wolkenstein, who was writing in the Tyrol before the middle of the fifteenth century, knows Gredel as a typical name for a peasant girl.² Furthermore, he makes it plain in another place that "liebe Gret" can scarcely have been all that she should be.³ Oswald had been in Northern Germany, but that fact scarcely proves his adoption of a use foreign to his native speech. One is whimsically tempted to see some significance in the fact that Oswald's wife was named Margarethe, but this clue will not lead us farther. When Beda Weber, the first editor of Oswald's poems, groups together references to Grete and the wife, he is probably doing so for convenience. We can be sure that Grete was in bad odor in South-eastern Germany at this time, for Hans Heselloher, who wrote a few years later, joins Gredel and Mätz, another name with unpleasant associations.⁴ Furthermore, his verses

er sey des adels also wol
ein graff von Lorion,
wie wol ers mit Gredlin kan⁵

are unequivocal, whatever the allusion to Lorion—Maschek, the latest editor, offers the admittedly desperate conjecture Luderjan (p. 304)—may imply.

Conjectures about the origin of these associations with the name Grete are naturally more or less uncertain until additional early examples are available. Clearly Grete owes its bad odor to the words that it resembles, and these words need not have the remotest etymological or historical connections with Grete or with each other. It is probably pertinent to any conjecture to point out that the meaning seems to have faded somewhat in the course of time. Oswald von Wolkenstein, Hans Heselloher, and the other early users of Grete seem to couple with it sexual implications, either good or bad. In modern vernacular use Grete suggests according to Meisinger, either stupidity or a peasant background and does not imply doubtful morals.

² H. Maschek, *Lyrik des späten Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1939), pp. 86-87, which may be found in J. Schatz (ed.), *Die Gedichte Oswalds von Wolkenstein*⁹ (Göttingen, 1904), pp. 124-25.

³ Maschek, p. 93 = Schatz, p. 173.

⁴ Maschek, p. 97 = A. Hartmann, *Romanische Forschungen*, v (1890), 451.

⁵ Maschek, p. 97 = Hartmann, p. 451.

In looking for possible origins, we should of course start from the earlier meaning. Kaspar Stieler connected *Grete* with *grete* 'desiderata' (from *greten*).⁶ Although his etymology is wrong, he may not have been so far off in indicating the associations of *Grete* for the speaker of German in his day. Inasmuch as these associations reach farther back than Stieler, who wrote in the second half of the seventeenth century, we might examine words and ideas likely to be familiar in the Middle Ages. My friend Professor John G. Kunstmann, who has generously verified some bothersome references, wonders, for example, whether *greten*, MHG *grêten* 'die Beine auseinander spreizen' or St. Margarethe, the patroness of women in childbed, could have helped build up these associations.⁷ As evidence of their close relation to the meaning of *Grete* I add that Margarethe is said to be a name often given to girls of illegitimate origin in Salzburg,—a reference that I owe to Professor Grant Loomis.⁸

ARCHER TAYLOR

University of California,
Berkeley

A NOTE ON THE U-DECLENSION IN OLD NORSE

Since the *i* in *kviðr* 'a saying, judgment,' and in *siðr* 'custom, manner' represents an original *e*,¹ we should have expected the forms **kveðr* < **kveður* (cf. *verðr* 'meal' < **werður*) and **sjoðr* < **seður* (cf. *mjoðr* 'mead' < **meður*).

Erik Noreen² derives *kviðr* from **kveðjur*. But the assumption of a *ju*-suffix has no historical support and is therefore really begging the question. Noreen was evidently forced to this hypothesis because he assumed that the *i* in *kviðr* is phonetically correct. It is far more likely that the *i* in both *kviðr* and *siðr* was borrowed by analogy from the *u*-stems with radical vowel PGmc *i*, such as *friðr*, *kvistr*, *liðr*, *limr*, *viðr*, etc.

The primary point of contact between the two types was evidently the *ð* directly following the radical vowel, for where *ð* does

⁶ Cited in *Deutsches Wörterbuch*.

⁷ Cited in *Deutsches Wörterbuch*.

⁸ Schukowitz, *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, VII (1897), 100.

¹ Cf. *kviðr* : *kveða* 'to say'; *siðr* : Grk. *ἔθος* 'custom.'

² Cf. Erik Noreen, "Kviða: en Hypothes," *Festschrift für Eugen Mogk* (Halle an der Saale, 1914), p. 62.

not directly follow the radical vowel the two types are otherwise kept strictly apart (cf. *verðr* with *kviðr*: *viðr*, and **kelur* > *kjölr* with *siðr*: *viðr*). Since *e* did not suffer breaking after *v*, an original **kveðr* (< **kveður*) could all the more easily have been displaced by *kviðr* after the pattern of *kviðr* 'belly' (Goth. *qipus*): *viðr*, where no breaking could occur. On the other hand, if the *ð* directly following the radical vowel represents the only point of contact between *siðr* and the *i*-type, then the discrepancy between *siðr* and *mjoðr* (where *ð* likewise directly follows the radical vowel) is left unexplained. This discrepancy, however, is removed if we assume another point of contact between the *i*-type and the *e*-type, viz., the congruence of the radical vowel *i* (due to the *i*-umlaut of *e*) with original PGmc *i*. This falling together of the radical vowel in both types originally took place in the dat. sing. (cf. *viði*: *siði* < **seði*) and in the nom. plur. form (cf. *viðir*: *siðir* < **seðir*) but in historical times was extended by analogy with the *i*-stems to the acc. plur. form (cf. *við-u*, *-i*: *sið-i* instead of **sjoð-u* < **seð-u*). The phonetically correct radical vowel *i* of the *e*-type in two of the declensional forms and the later analogical radical vowel *i* in the acc. plur. must have furnished a point of contact³ between the two types aside from the *ð* directly following the radical vowel, resulting in the complete displacement of original *e* in favor of *i*. The substantive *mjoðr* escaped this displacement evidently because this *u*-stem had no plural forms, and therefore only the dat. sing. form *miði* contained the radical vowel *i*. The example of *mjoðr* over against *siðr* (instead of **sjoðr*) indicates that the *ð* directly following the radical vowel was not the only factor in connection with the displacement of *e* by *i* in the *e*-type.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

University of Kansas

³ Cf. the contact between the *a*-stems and the *u*-stems due to the congruence of the radical vowels *i* and *e*. In the *a*-stems *i*: *e* represent PGmc *i*: *e*; in the *u*-stems *i*: *e* are the result of *i*-umlaut of *e*: *a* (cf. *smiðr*, *smið-ar*, *-ir*, *-i* with *sið-ir*, *-i*; *vegr*, *veg-ar*, *-ir* with *meg-ir*, etc.).

Heusler's remark (*Aisl. Elementarb.*², § 225, Anm.): "Bei Wörtern die den Umlauten und der Brechung unzugänglich sind, wie *vegr* "Weg," *siðr* "Sitte," unterscheiden sich *u*- und *i*-Flexion überhaupt nur im Akk. Pl."—is misleading so far as the phonetic development of *siðr* is concerned. Only after **sjoðr* (< **seður*) had been displaced by *siðr* was either umlaut or breaking impossible. Heusler evidently regards the form *siðr* as phonetically correct.

HEINSCHKE, F. = 'SEED-POD'

Hieronymus Bock's *New Kreütter Büch*, Straßburg, 1539, has three instances of this apparently unrecorded word:

Von Weiderich . . . Dregt lange heinschen oder schotten, wie die gemeynen braunen violen. (I, 47^a); Die anderen grossen garten Erweyssen, sind mit stengeln, blettern, rippen, faden, weissen bluomen, vnd heinschen oder schifen, den obgenanten Schott Erweyssen gleich. (II, 6^b); Zuom dritten, das die bonen, vber andere garten vnd kuchenfrucht geschlacht seien, der massen, das eyn mal hundert Bonen in eynem scapo oder schotten gefunden sind worden &c. Solche oberrente zeychen, fint man gar nit an vnsern Bonen, dann vnser Bonen keymen bald . . . Zuo dem so gewinnen sie kürzere vnd schlechtere wurtzeln, weder die andere legumina, auch fint man selten vber sechs Bonen in eyner heynschen, ich geschweydz man hundert solt finden &c. (II, 11^a).

Neither Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch* nor P. Kretschmer's *Wortgeographie der deutschen Umgangssprache* mentions this synonym of 'Hülse,' 'Schote.' The meaning of *Heinsche*, coupled in Bock's text with *Schote* and *Schiff*, is perfectly clear, but its etymology is not so obvious. At first glance, to be sure, one might be tempted to compare it with *Heinschkraut*, *gnaphalium stoechas*, *mottenkraut*, cited DWb. IV, 2, 887 from Nemnich,¹ and *heinskraut*, *hünstkraut*, cited from Alberus. But *Heinschkraut* and *Heinskraut* are variants of *Hinschkraut*, which designates any herb that is good for the *Hinsche*, or *hünische Sucht*; cf. DWb. IV, 2, 1468; Fischer, *Schwäb. Wb.* III, 1558 f.

¹ Among other German equivalents of *Gnaphalium stoechas*, Nemnich (II, 63) lists: *Mottenkraut*, *Mottenblume*, *Schimmelkraut*, *Sonnengoldblume*, and *Feinschkraut*, but not *Heinschkraut*. I take it that *Feinschkraut* is a misprint, despite the fact that it reappears in the German section of Nemnich (III, 146): "Feinschkraut, *Gnaphalium stoechas*," whence it passes over into the DWb. III, 240. *Hinschkraut*, *Gnaphalium stoechas*, appears in its alphabetical place in Nemnich (III, 240). A similar misprint in Nemnich (I, 458; III, 300) is *Kinschwurzel*, *Aristolochia clematitis*, taken over into the DWb. V, 779. In DWb. IV, 1470, however, under *Hinschkraut*, the note is added: "das theil 5, 779 aufgeführte *kinschwurzel* osterluzei scheint den ersten theil unseres wortes verderbt zu enthalten." In support of this conjecture compare Bock I, 45^b: "Die namen beder Aristolochie, sind fast droben angezeygt, doch das man merck, das die lang die wir Dactylitin vnd Masculam genent haben, sei die Osterluzey, oder Biberwurtz, die etlich auch Hynschkraut genent. Doch vom Hynschkraut im capitel ye lenger ye lieber."

A survey of the other terms used by Bock for 'seed-pod' or 'seed-container,' may give us a clue to the etymology of *Heinsche*. My list of such expressions, which does not pretend to be complete, contains the following: *Bolle, Häfelin, Häuslin, Hörnlin, Knöpflin, Kölblin, Kopf, Köpflin, Münchskopf, Säcklin, Scheff, Schiff, Schifflin, Scheide, Schotte, Schötlin, Tasche, and Täschlin*:

samen, je ij. oder iij. sämlin in eynem stachelechten heüßlin (I, 2^a); Nach der blüet samet es in heüßlin, der ist gleich dem Agley samen (I, 3^a); Nach den bluomen erscheinen fünffECKECHTE, vnd viereckECHTE beschloßne schotten, aber vnderscheyden, gleich wie eyn Motz,² mit iiij. oder fünff stollen geformiert. In eym jeden heüßlin, der iiij. oder fünff an jeder schotten seind, findt man eyn kolschwartzten schonen samen (I, 6^b); Nach der blüet würt eyn horecht köpfflin darauß, das ist der samen (I, 16^b); darauß werden viereckete vnd auch fünff eckete schötlin eyner Motzen mit den vier schollen gleichförmig (I, 17^a); spitzige schifflin eynem gersten korn gleichförmig, darinn findt man schwartzten samen (I, 18^b); zwen Cressen . . . mit vilen teschelin oder Seckelin vnd fast kleinem gälem samen (I, 20^b); Die tragen bluomen gäl vnd bleich biß oben auß, daraus werden scheyden fingers lang vol samens (I, 24^a); Mit kraut stengel, bluomen, schotten, somen vnnd geschmack dem Senff gleich, (ib.); Die schötlin mit dem samen (ib.; the terms *scheyde, schotte, and schötlin* on this page refer to the same plant); Darauß zuo letst lange schötlin oder hörnlin wachssen, darinn gäler bleicher kleyner samen zeitig (I, 25^b); Darauß werden köpflin oder häffelin, inwendig wie die flachs bollen, mit sechs fachen vnderschieden (I, 28^a); Im zeittigen köpflin . . . findt man samen (I, 29^a); Do der Magsamen zeittig ward, stunden die köpff offen. Der samen so darinn ist, felt selber auß (I, 30^a); werden kölblin darauß . . . das ist der sam (I, 31^b); mit dem kleynen secklin vnd runden köpflin darin verborgen (I, 32^a); So die bluom abfelt, würt eyn runder Münchs kopff darauß, das ist der samen (I, 37^a); darauß werden lange spitzige schotten, oder scheffen, als eyn Storckenschnabel (I, 46^b); Die schefen aber rumpffen sich eylens, als die springende keß maden (I, 49^b); den . . . samen . . . in kleynen teschlin verschlossen (I, 55^a); dz groß mit den breytten teschen . . . dragen bede kleynen geelen samen in teschlin (I, 58^b); eyn jedes secklin darin der samen ist, (I, 59^a); werden runde horichte bollen oder knöpflin darauß, die sind vol samens (I, 59^b); samen . . . in breytten teschen, verwaret (I, 70^a); Das ander mit den geelen bluomen, vnd runden teschen (ib.); Nachtschaden mit den rotten schotten, oder schefen (I, 88^a); werden schifflin darauß, etwan fingers lang, mit breytten gelen rundem samen gefült (I, 166^a); der baum *Euonymus* sei mit seinen bollen oder schotten dem *Sesamo* gleich (II, 23^a); den Pfeffer, nit in schotten oder schefen sunder bloß klotzicht beieynander gedrunge (II, 86^b).

We have here the names of a large variety of objects, the par-

² Mütze.

ticular shape of which suggested the designation for seed-pod in a given case. Why then should not *Handschuh* likewise have been used in a similar manner? The *DWb.* (iv. 2, 416) records forms such as *hendschuh*, *hentschue*, *hentzuch*, *hinschug*, *henszag*, *händschich*, *händsche*, *hendsche*, and *hensche*, which latter form, particularly, is noted for Switzerland and the region along the Rhine: "panzer, huben, kessel, hüett, henschen, armzüg, und wz harnesch ist und harnesch heisset. *weisth.* 4, 363 (schweiz. v. j. 1398)"; "spigel, henschen ende gewant / salt du balde van dir duen. Haupt 3, 331 (mittelrhein. 14. jahrh.)." Fischer (*Schwäb. Wb.* III, 1129) cites the forms *Häntschen* and *Händschen*; Follmann (*Wb. der Deutsch-lothringischen Mundarten* 228) notes the forms *Händsch*, *Hänsch*, *Hintsche*, and, most striking of all, *Heintsche*: "Schon urkundl. . . . ein par Heintschen St. R. A. 41." In all these cases cited from the dictionaries the word in its various spellings is used in its literal sense of 'glove.' Finally, in Jos. Müller's *Rheinisches Wörterbuch* (III, 202), we meet with *Händsche* used in the transferred sense: "Erbsen-, Bohnenschote; die Buhnen ho schonn Händschen esu langk wie mei Fenger." Nothing prevents us, therefore, from deriving *Heinsche*, 'seed-pod,' from *Handschuh*, 'glove.'

W. KURRELMAYER

MÄUSEKORB = MAUSEFALLE (?)

In the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* of the Grimms (vi, 1825) Moriz Heyne cites the *Zimmerische Chronik* (III, 368 f.) to confirm his definition of *Mausefalle* for *Mäusekorb*. In order to test this meaning, it will be necessary to reproduce the passage at greater length. The situation is as follows: In 1540, Christoph von Landenberg, a lawless baron, had been summoned before the Imperial Court for his wanton attacks on the possessions of the city of Rottweil. Thereupon Landenberg, asserting that Count Gottfrid Werner von Zimmern had instigated the action against him, declared war also on Count Gottfrid Werner. As Landenberg was credited at one time with having as many as 2500 men under his banner, Count Gottfrid Werner (*not* Landenberg, as the *DWb.* states) was afraid to leave his castle of Wildenstein:

Weiter hat Landenberg wider Zimbern nichts tâtlichs gehandelt. Noch so hat im der graf user obgehörten ursachen hoch entsessen. Er het domals ain secretarium, hieß Paulus Stecher . . . der hat allenthalben von ime ußgeben, er hab ime zu Wildenstain so übel gefurcht, das er mermals mit dem haupt wider die wandt geloffen sei. Das mag gleichwol sein, ich kans aber nit glauben. Wie er aber in Wildenstain sei verspottet und veracht worden und das er nit herauß dörfen, do wer wol von zu sagen. Der alt herr Wilhelm, truchseß, nampts nur das beschließen im meuskorb, gleichwol derselbig alt herr, wie hievor in dieser historia auch gemeldet, in genere nichts uf den vesten und werlichen heusern het. Iedoch kam im hernach dieser meuskorb wol zu staten im schmalkaldischen und auch im furstenkrieg, do er sein böste haab, die er het von mobilien, dohin flöhenet, zu gleich wie andere auch.

It appears that Count Gottfrid Werner had not been captured, his castle of Wildenstein had not even been threatened, but he was in such mortal fear of his powerful adversary, that he chose to make himself a voluntary captive in his stronghold. He could have left it whenever he pleased, he was not caught in a trap. It is more logical, therefore, to identify *Meuskorb* with MHG. *mûzkorp*, "käficht, in welchen die vögel zur zeit der mauße gesetzt wurden." Beneke (*Mhd. Wb.* II, 1, 281) gives merely this definition, with the statement that the word occurs in the *Schwabenspiegel*. I have found the passage, in Lassberg's edition, 1840, § 239: "Unde stilt ein man dem andern vederspil ab einer stange. oder vz sinem mvz korbe." (Some Mss. have simply "korbe" instead of "mvz korbe"). Lexer (I, 2262) adds two references, to Mynsinger's *Von den Falken, Pferden und Hunden*, a work written before 1450, the manuscript of which is dated 1473:

ainer hennen Hertz, vnd sol das dem Habich geben newn tag zu essen, Ee man In in den maußkorb gestoßen hat. . . vnd hönig darunder mischen vnd dem habich zway male davon nüchtern geben, darnach sol man In in den Maußkorb stoßen. (*Bibl. Litt. Ver.* LXXI, 40); Hat der Habich für sich mer gemaußt, so sol man In in den Maußkorb nit Ee stoßen dann in dem Monat, den man haisset den Jenner; hat er aber vor kain mauß vnd ist nur von ainem Jar, so sol man In in dem häwmonat einstoßen vnd alsdann sol man In ätzen mit lebendigen vogeln, mag man die gehalten. . . Vnd der maußkorb sol Im recht vnd weitt gnüg sein, vnd wann er die mauß gantz an Im hat, so sol man In wider heruß nemen. (*ib.* 46).

A still more instructive passage, and one not cited in the dictionaries, occurs in a sermon of Johann Geiler von Kaiserberg:¹

¹ *Predigen Teütsch: vnd vil gütter leeren Des hoch geleerten herrn*

Ain habich wenn sich der maussen sol / vnd die alden fedren lassen fallen · so schleüßt man yn/in ainen maußkorb/ da fleüget er hyn vnd her / vnd stoßt die alten fedren ab / vnd erneüweret sich / vnd wirt also zureden ain neüwer fogel Also welicher mensch begert seinen alten menschen / der bösen gewonhait abzüziehen · vnd sich iüngen oder erneuern /

The very fact that Geiler uses the *Mauskorb* to enforce his point in a sermon proves that his hearers were perfectly familiar with the matter. And fifty years later the compiler of the *Zimmerische Chronik* could be sure that his allusion would be understood by his contemporaries. His statement "das er mermals mit dem haupt wider die wandt geloffen seie" completes the parallel with Geiler's description: "da fleüget er hyn vnd her / vnd stoßt die alten fedren ab." There can be little doubt but that *Meuskorb* means *Korb zum Mausern*, and not *Mausefalle*.

W. KURRELMAYER

NOTES ON NICOLL'S HAND-LIST FOR 1800-1850

In Allardyce Nicoll's *Hand-list of Plays Produced between 1800 and 1850*, Volume II of *A History of Early Nineteenth Century Drama*, four of the entries given to Charles James Mathews do not belong to him.

Country Cousins (Lyceum, Feb. 28, 1820) was the third "At Home" of his father Charles Mathews and was written by James Smith, Esq.,¹ who had written for his second "At Home," *A Trip to Paris* (Lyc. March 8, 1819), the fourth and concluding part "La Diligence."²

Christmas at Brighton (Lyc., Feb. 1820) is the third part of *Country Cousins*,³ "Exhibition of the Multiplication Table during a Christmas at Brighton."

The Hypochondriac (Lyc., Mar. 1, 1821) is the second part of

Johān von Kaisersperg, Augspurg, 1508, fol. 108^d. See Goedeke I, 399, 9; copy in my possession.

¹ *Memoirs of Charles Mathews, Comedian*, by Mrs. Mathews, second edition (London, 1839), III, 106.

² *Ibid.*, p. 52.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 108; *Times*, February 29, 1820.

the first "At Home," *Mail Coach Adventures*, given at the Lyceum Mar. 2, 1818. This part is described on the program as "An Experimental Lecture of Ventriloquy."⁴ The *Times* for February 27, 1821, carries a notice of the repetition of "the original series of these popular entertainments for two nights only," in which part two is described as "a petite piece called the Hypochondriac." Mrs. Mathews, who is usually careful to attribute pieces to their authors, makes no mention of their son's authorship and says this first "At Home" was "composed of materials which had been presented to the public during the previous ten years."⁵

Pong Wong (Haymarket, Sept. 13, 1826), is here rightly given to Charles J. Mathews,⁶ but it also appears for this same theatre and date in the list of unknown authors.

The Home Circuit; or, Cockney Gleanings (Lyc., Mar. 12, 1827) was the eighth "At Home" and was presented at the Lyceum March 8.⁷ Part two was the famous "Monopolylogue to introduce the Dead alive, entitled Mathew's Dream; or, The Theatrical Gallery" in which he exhibited "whole-length portraits" of the late actors: Suett, Kemble, King, Cooke, and Incedon, each in a famous character. Mrs. Mathews makes no mention of the author.

In the period 1824-1826, while architect in Wales to the Welsh Iron and Coal Mining Company, Charles James Mathews says he devoted his evenings to literary and dramatic pursuits. "In conjunction with Richard Peake, the popular dramatist, I was constantly employed in providing material for my father" and wrote "pieces for the theatre such as 'Pong-wong,' 'Pyramus and Thisbe,' 'Truth,' 'My Wife's Mother,' 'The Wolf and the Lamb,' 'The Court Jester,' &c. &c."⁸ Peake had worked into a dramatic piece called *Jonathan in England* (Lyc., Sept. 3, 1824) the character of Jonathan W. Doubikins in Matthews' sixth "At Home,"

⁴ *Memoirs*, II, 443. The bill of entertainment and notices (pp. 451-2) identify it and describe it as "the most surprising portion of the entertainment."

⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 443, 416, letter to Mrs. Mathews from Worthing.

⁶ *The Life of Charles James Mathews, Chiefly Autobiographical*, ed. Charles Dickens (London, 1879), I, 255; II, 327.

⁷ *Memoirs*, III, 583, and the *Times*, March 7 and 8, 1827.

⁸ *The Life of C. J. Mathews*, I, 255.

A Trip to America (Lyc., Mar. 25, 1824),⁹ for which Charles J. had supplied Jonathan's Song. Charles J. was a fluent versifier in the then popular style of Theodore Hook¹⁰ and supplied his father with many songs. Peake helped Mathews work up the material of several of his "At Homes" (Part III of *Adventures in Air, Earth, and Water*, 1821; *The Young Days of Mr. Mathews*, 1822; *Mr. Mathews' Memorandum Book*, 1825; *The Comic Annual for 1830*) and collaborated with Charles James Mathews on *The Comic Annals* for 1831, 1832, 1833.¹¹ "Mr. Peake contributed . . . the woof on which Mr. Mathews, by the force of his peculiar genius, has placed so comical a warp."¹²

Charles James Mathews was also the author of the following pieces listed in the *Hand-list* under unknown authors.

Mathews and Co. (Princess's, Mar. 9, 1846).¹³

Methinks I see my Father (Lyc., Nov. 7, 1849).¹⁴

Who Killed Cock Robin (Covent Garden, Dec. 14, 1829).¹⁵

The identification of several other pieces from the *Hand-list* under unknown authors may here be made.

On the authority of Dutton Cook¹⁶ the following five pieces may be attributed to Jane M. Scott, daughter of the owner and manager of the Sans Pareil.¹⁷

⁹ *Memoirs*, III, 516. In the controversy that arose over this farce, Mathews (III, 539) in his defense makes clear how he and Peake collaborated.

¹⁰ *Life of C. J. Mathews*, I, 207, 217, 223.

¹¹ *Memoirs*, III, 176, 460. Peake called himself "your Monsieur Scribe." For the way in which Mathews found material for these "At Homes" see the letters to James Smith, from Philadelphia, Feb. 23, 1823 (III, 380-392), and to C. F. Harding, Jan. 27, 1832 (IV, 94), and Mrs. Mathews' comment on these entertainments (III, 449).

¹² *Ibid.*, IV, 178.

¹³ *Life of C. J. Mathews*, II, 327.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 323.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 327. This is probably one of his early pieces. As a two-act farce, he played it at the Haymarket, Nov. 13, 1865.

¹⁶ *On the Stage* (London, 1883), I, 153.

¹⁷ H. Barton Baker, *History of the London Stage* (London, 1904), p. 414: "The company was evidently of the most mediocre description, everything depending upon that tremendously energetic and industrious lady, Miss Scott, who not only performed in all the pieces except the pantomimes, but, according to the playbills, wrote them nearly all."

The Forest Knight; or, The King Bewildered (Sans Pareil, Feb. 4, 1813). *Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library*, no. 1757.

Mary the Maid of the Inn; or, The Bough of Yew (Sans P., Dec. 27, 1809). *Larpent Plays*, no. 1603.

Raykisinah the Outcast (Sans P., Nov. 22, 1813). *Larpent Plays*, no. 1784, called on the MS. *The Outlaw; or, The Hollow Tree*. Cook misspells the title, "*Rakisnah*."

The Red Robber; or, The Statue in the Woods (Sans P., Dec. 3, 1808).

Ulthona the Sorceress (Sans P., Nov., 1807. Cook misspells this title, "*Ultharusa*."

Two more plays can be identified from Mrs. Mathews' *Memoirs of Charles Mathews*.

He's No Conjuror (Adelphi, Jan. 5, 1829). C. T. Harding, *Memoirs*, iv, 35 f. n.

Wanted a Partner; or, "A Bill Due Sept. 29th" (Adel., Sept. 29, 1828). Samuel Beasley, Jr., *Memoirs*, iv, 1. Nicoll attributes this to Buckstone. Buckstone was the author of the second piece on this bill, *My Absent Son*. This was the opening bill of the new partnership of Yates and Mathews at the Adelphi and doubtless Mrs. Mathews knew all the circumstances and details of her husband's new venture. "The introductory piece was the production of Mr. Beasley, the well-known architect," she writes.

The Twelve Months (Strand, Dec. 18, 1834) is an early burlesque of Gilbert Abbott à Beckett. See *The Stage Cyclopaedia*, p. 456.

The Peacock and the Crow (Adel., Feb. 6, 1837) was a "Jim Crow" piece by Thomas Parry. Mrs. Stirling acted in it with "Jim Crow" Rice. See Percy Allen, *The Stage Life of Mrs. Stirling* (London, 1922), p. 42.

Omadhaun; or, Poor Dog Tray (Sadler's Wells, Oct. 13, 1835) is probably an earlier version of the play of the same name by H. P. Grattan produced at the Queen's, Nov. 24, 1877. Grattan was writing melodramas as early as 1835 and continued writing for the theatre till his death in 1899.

The Minerali (English Opera House, Dec. 21, 1835) is also by H. P. Grattan. Nicoll lists this under the name of Henry Grattan Plunkett (Royal Victoria, July 1, 1835), where it is subtitled, as in the MS. submitted to the Examiner of Plays, *The Betrothed*.

The Stage Cyclopaedia, recording a performance at the Victoria Lyceum, Dec. 21, 1835, has it subtitled *The Dying Gift*. The place of performance of *The Stage Cyclopaedia* citation is obviously wrong, for the *Times* announceemnt has the English Opera House. Grattan's full name was Henry Willoughby Grattan Plunkett.

Richmond Hill; or, The Widow and the Bailiff (Lord Chamberlain, Olympic, Nov. 5, 1827) and *Touch and Take; or, Saturday Night and Monday Morning* (Olym., Nov. 12, 1827) are the same piece. A letter to the Examiner of Plays changing the first title to the second is bound in with the MS. of *The Counterfitters*, Nov. 5, 1827, Lord Chamberlain's MSS., British Museum. Hence the note to *Completely Successful; or, The Undutiful Father* (Olym., Oct. 27, 1827) which suggests that it may be *Touch and Take* is wrong because there is no similarity of plots.

In the list of authors James Bruton, author of *Bathing* (Olym., Jan. 31, 1842) and James Burton, author of *Davis and Sally Dear* (Olym., Mar. 7, 1842) are one and the same. On the MS. copy of *Davis and Sally Dear* submitted to the Examiner of Plays, Lord Chamberlain's MSS., British Museum, there is a notation, "by the author of *Bathing*." The correct spelling is Bruton.

The first entry under Henry Thornton Craven is a burletta, *Tom Smart* (City of London, Oct. 12, 1827). After the fourth entry, *Bletchington House* (C. L., Apr. 20, 1846), is an editorial note on a play, acted at St. James's Dec. 26, 1836, called *Bletchington House; or, The Warning Voice*. "If this is Craven's it was produced when he was only 18 years old; but it probably is a different drama." *Tom Smart*, then, would have been produced when Craven was only nine years old, for he was born in 1818. This, too, is probably a different drama. According to Nicoll (I, 225) the City of London opened Mar. 27, 1837.

MAJL EWING

*The University of California at
Los Angeles*

REVIEWS

The Intent of the Artist. By SHERWOOD ANDERSON, THORNTON WILDER, ROGER SESSIONS, WILLIAM LESCAZE. Edited, with an introduction, by AUGUSTO CENTENO. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1941. Pp. vi + 162. \$2.50.

The Intent of the Critic. By EDMUND WILSON, NORMAN FOERSTER, JOHN CROWE RANSOM, and W. H. AUDEN. Edited by DONALD A. STAUFFER. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, [1941]. Pp. vi + 147. \$2.50.

Fifteen Poets. Oxford: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1941. Pp. xiv + 503. \$1.45.

The Novel and Society, A Critical Study of the Modern Novel. By N. ELIZABETH MONROE. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1941. Pp. x + 282. \$3.00.

At a time when criticism of the arts tends more and more either to investigation of origins and "causes" or to the ingenious exhibition of technical complexities within the given work, an attempt to say something about the nature and value of esthetic activity as such is particularly welcome. *The Intent of the Artist*, however, is no more than the merest sketch of an introduction to an esthetic inquiry. Sherwood Anderson discusses with vivacity and honesty, but without conspicuous originality or profundity, the nature of the fiction writer's imagination: good stuff for a freshman class in fiction to read, and sound enough as far as it goes, which is not very far. Thornton Wilder's very brief discussion of playwriting is concerned with explaining the nature and value of the acted drama with economy, precision, and a hard-hitting, sensible style. Discussing with adroitness if not with depth the nature of the dramatic medium, the conditions of dramatic presentation, the relations between creator, actor and audience, and similar topics, Mr. Wilder gives us not an esthetic inquiry but a useful preliminary to one. Roger Sessions presents some introductory considerations concerning the nature of musical movement in an interesting essay that cries out for further development. His remarks on musical form are pertinent and sound; but one thinks of Donald Tovey's essays and wishes that Mr. Sessions had gone deeper into the matter. William Lescaze concludes with a dialogue on architecture, pointing out that in buildings efficiency automatically produces beauty—convincing enough, but avoiding all the important questions concerning the relation between form and function, and not differen-

tiating between different functions. (A drab and jerry-built row of miners' cottages would efficiently serve the function of depressing the miners' morale so that they avoided militance and became docile workers, which may have been the intention. Is this efficiency beauty?) Augusto Centeno has the difficult job of tying up these essays in an introduction: attempting to get underneath all the other discussions at once he is perhaps more profound but also more ambiguous, and a certain imprecision in diction is forced upon him. He makes some suggestive points, but the whole is too sketchy to be more than a text for comment. "The intent of the artist" needs more elaborate discussion than this.

The Intent of the Critic, a collection of five essays on the nature and function of literary criticism, disappoints somewhat, because none of the essays are long enough to allow the author to develop or to integrate his points. Further, the essays were written in deliberate isolation from each other, so that they never touch, the differences of opinion are never argued about, nobody is challenged to explain what he means or defend his position. If John Crowe Ransom had expanded his suggestive analogy between poetry and a democratic state and had inquired more carefully into the proposition that "a poem is a *logical structure* having a *local texture*"; if W. H. Auden had paused to explain why he would never trust a philosopher who liked Brahms or why the doctrine of original sin is the only religious idea that can be stated as a dogma; if Norman Foerster had discussed more explicitly the relation between reason and the "ethical imagination"; all of these writers would have produced more impressive essays. A round table discussion might have been a better form than separate collections of epigrams and *dicta*; for without argument opinion can never be known for what it really is.

Ransom's essay is the most profound: the points he makes are few but penetrating, and his remarks on the relation of structure to texture in poetry contain the germ of a whole poetic. But the argument is not sustained, the insights are not integrated. And he seems constitutionally unable to conduct a philosophical discourse smoothly. Nevertheless his essay fulfills its function: it is a grand text for more than one sermon on art, and there are some sentences that ought to be read solemnly in University English classes at regular intervals.

Edmund Wilson's practice is better than his theory. His own criticism—explanation of the work in terms of origins, considered both historically and psychologically—is among the best of its kind, but his essay on "the historical interpretation of literature" is a rather lame affair. He gives a brief (so brief as to be of little value) account of the rise of "historical" criticism, and then proceeds to give his view of the nature of art. The aesthetic theory which he gives us is both naïve and inadequate. Art, he tells us, is an attempt to give a meaning to our experience, and he compares Euclid. Art "cures us of some ache of disorder" and the resultant relief brings

us the sense of power, accompanied by joy. I wonder how much "joy" Mr. Wilson gets out of reading *Ædipus Rex* or watching a performance of *Othello*.

Mr. Foerster has his familiar story to tell, and he attacks naturalism and pleads for the new humanism in the manner that is by now traditional. "Tintern Abbey," he reminds us, is "a superb expression of unwisdom," to be contrasted with the same poet's sonnet on Milton. We know that Mr. Foerster has thought through his position more carefully than this essay would lead one to think; but here he says either too little or too much. We demand a more precise and a more profound discussion of the relation between art and ethics.

W. H. Auden's world view always seems to be affected by the latest book he has read. His essay on "Criticism in a Mass Society" is bright but brittle, a challenging mixture of the true, the apparently true, and the paradoxical. But his essay has some real substance, and it stimulates rather than allays thought. A little more sobriety in his discourse, and he may yet be able to make a point.

Mr. Stauffer makes a noble attempt to introduce these disparate essays with an inclusive foreword. What he says about criticism is interesting, but one is not sure that he really understands all the essays he is editing.

Fifteen Poets gives us extracts (about a thousand lines from each poet) from the work of Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, Pope, Cowper, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Shelley, Byron, Keats, Browning, Tennyson, and Arnold. Each extract is preceded by a very brief discussion of the poet, each by a different hand. Not possessing (or aiming at) the grandiose comprehensiveness of the typical American anthology, this book of selections is reasonable in size and limited in scope: it should, therefore, be very useful in introducing students to the great English poets. The bewildering variety of most anthologies of poetry hinders rather than helps the student in his attempt to form some clear introductory ideas about the art.

One might quarrel with some of the selections (the Chaucer and the Dryden, perhaps) but on the whole this is a very serviceable introduction to the major English poets. It is a little difficult to justify the presence of Cowper, but since he is here we are glad to have him. The introductory essays are hampered by brevity, and the writer has to choose between a summary of the accepted views regarding the poet (H. S. Bennett on Chaucer), an autobiographical statement by the critic (C. S. Lewis on Spenser, and he does a good job), an attempt to solve a single central problem about the author's works (M. R. Ridley on Coleridge), or the suggestion of a few new ideas (Auden on Byron). The student should be encouraged to read these introductions after, and not before, he has read the poems.

Miss Monroe has neither the acuteness nor the eloquence to persuade those who did not believe in her thesis before they read her book. This is a "ringing indictment" of modern society and the

evil effects of modern scepticism on modern fiction. There is, of course, a convincing case for the position that without a central philosophy holding a civilization together great art is difficult if not impossible to produce. If Miss Monroe had been content to argue this general thesis, and illustrate it with references to modern works of fiction, she might have written a more persuasive book than she has. But she is hasty and angry and narrow, and her argument that only a religious society can produce great literature does not convince.

One has the feeling that Miss Monroe has not properly read the books she is discussing—at least not those she attacks. Her misconceptions of some of them are shocking. Her remarks on Huxley's *Point Counter Point* show a complete lack of awareness of the fact that the book (like all Huxley's early novels) is the anguished record of a frustrated idealist's unsuccessful search for value, and her naïve identification of the characters in the novel with the author is preposterous. She ought, as a professed moralist, to know that it takes a moral man to recognize and be horrified by immorality: Huxley's novels are the outraged records of life without value. But Miss Monroe misses this point as she mis-reads so many authors because of a curious simplicity of mind that makes her mis-read any book which is not obviously on her side in the struggle for Christianity. She talks of Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* as "without pattern," whereas the novel is patterned with a care and a subtlety that sets every comma in a careful scheme.

Miss Monroe's favorite critical term is "moving," and she has a general tendency to equate autobiography with criticism. In spite of certain real insights and a few bright remarks, she has not produced a book of literary criticism. She has no clear literary criteria, and no method for distinguishing between works of art and their creators. It is enough to mention that she takes Willa Cather as "the prototype of the future" because (1) her books can be read by bankers and clerks, whereas Virginia Woolf's can't, and (2) two of her novels "show a complete grasp of religious experience." All the critical views in this book are developed and expressed without any mental discipline. Yet Miss Monroe is not stupid. Her trouble is simply that she has not learned to read novels which don't come up to her preconceptions of what fiction ought to be. Her statements about the novels of Joyce, Huxley, Hemingway, and others, are quite fantastic: if the novel contains a vicious character it shows what a bad man the author is, etc. Such a method of approach, if applied to Shakespeare, would make him out a dirty old sinner. Miss Monroe should read, and ponder, *Hamlet*, *Measure for Measure*, and *Troilus and Cressida* and also brush up on *Piers Plowman* and *The Romance of the Rose*. For she means well and is not wholly afraid of literature, but she has yet to learn how to read a book.

DAVID DAICHES

The University of Chicago

Ben Jonson. Edited by C. H. HERFORD, PERCY and EVELYN SIMPSON. Volume VII. *The Sad Shepherd, The Fall of Mortimer, Masques and Entertainments*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1941. Pp. xxviii + 814. \$10.00.

Immediate attractiveness is given to this volume by the pictures, which are highly illustrative and well described. There are also numerous facsimiles from manuscripts and early editions. One may wish the editors had given more of these at the expense of the facsimiles of title-pages.

A critical introduction to the text is to appear in a later volume; final opinions should not be formed without it, though much can be gleaned from the special introductions in this and the preceding volumes. Why, for example, was collation of copies of the folios deemed unnecessary, even though that of copies of the quartos is often mentioned? Yet Mr. Hudson, in his edition of the *Poems* for the Facsimile Text Society, notes variations between different copies of the folio containing the *Underwoods*.

Of necessity, the present review deals only with the text. As apparatus for the work I had the printed editions of *The Sad Shepherd* and the *Masques*, photostats of the play and a few of the masques, and the first volume of the folio of 1640. Samples from these were collated with the new volume. Such collation would have been more rapidly done if the editors had given the pages of the text they followed. What has been done indicates that the work has been done with proper care. *Blacknesse* showed no unnoted deviations from the Folio of 1616.¹ More than a score of misprints in the critical apparatus have been noted, but none are important.

In Vol. 3, printed in 1927, the editors say that "the early texts are generally sound." This is so modified for the masques that both the Folios are called unsatisfactory; "Jonson did not read the proofs of the masques in the 1616 Folio as he had read the proofs of the plays"; some of the printing in the second Folio is "thoroughly bad" (p. xxvi). In spite of this, the Folios are "generally" followed. It seems that such a condition calls for use of the quarto texts as basic, even though slight changes may have been made for the Folio of 1616, and even for the later one.² Adherence to the Folio results in such corrections as [the] (*Blacknesse*, page 171, line 72), a[n] (*Beauty*, p. 186, line 164), make[s]

¹ In *Haddington*, p. 256, line 229, note d: titulus Q; p. 258, line 287: bridegrome F l; *Queens*, p. 313, line 685; Poets Ms (Chapman's facs.).

² For more on this topic see Mr. W. W. Greg's review of the volume in *MLR.*, xviii (1942), 144-166 and Mrs. Simpson's reply (*ibid.*, pp. 291-300). The present review, except for one clause, was written before reading either of them.

(*Haddington*, p. 258, line 298), all from the Quarto. The instances are normally as slight as this. This failure to base the text on Quartos sometimes called authoritative encourages a tendency toward a composite or eclectic text. The slightly puzzled feeling of the reader is not diminished by the editors' failure to tell for each masque what the basic text is, though sometimes, as for *Welbeck*, there is a statement: "Our text is based upon the Folio" (p. 790). Without consulting the notes one is not sure what text one is reading. In *Highgate*, p. 140, line 146 a word is corrected from Whalley to give who[se]; yet, (p. 143), line 240 is allowed to stand incorrect (as I infer) with the correction only in the textual note. Jonson's *Cipselli* is corrected to *Cipseli* (p. 181, line 16, note a), without textual authority, with indication only in the note; it should be *Cipsel*[l]i if corrected at all. In this instance Ben perhaps wrote the word with two ll's, as he could have found it in some editions of Cartari's *Le Imagini dei Dei degli Antichi*. The ligature made difficult the use of brackets to indicate that the form *Cesare* (p. 234, line 718, note b) has no support in the texts, though it does occur elsewhere and is correct. Indeed, some type of bracket is needed to indicate editorial changes in words without the omission or addition of letters, as *Icosaedron* (p. 178, line 277); this is correct, though it appeared in all the texts as *Iso-caedron*; Jonson may have written it thus, since I have seen it in the *Imprese* of Lucarini, 1623. Such changes require a warning sign. The same is true of editorial punctuation, if brackets are to be used at all.

The reader of the masques taken from manuscripts has even more difficulty in getting at the basic text. By giving the ms. exactly, even to errors, indicated in the notes, *Queens* departs from the custom of the volume. Should the ms. have been made basic when there are "clear signs of correction in the Quarto text" (p. 270)? Similarly, though "the Folio text is a slight revision," the ms. of *Pleasure Reconciled* is followed; the editors have "corrected it as little as possible" (p. 477). Two passages from it are said in the introduction to give "an important correction" (p. 476), yet in the editor's text the internal punctuation is that of the Folio, comma for semicolon. *Gypsies* is also printed from the ms. but the text printed is a "compromise": the stops have been supplied, "usually from the Duodecimo or Folio" (p. 563), but without indication whether from one or other or neither. Perhaps there is no good solution. The choice of text for this masque is difficult.

The editors hold the view that Jonson normally wrote the metrical apostrophe, as *to'enioy* (p. 157, line 86), instead of substituting an apostrophe for one vowel, as *t'enjoy*. Hence there are a large number of corrections inserting the vowel without textual authority. This was also done for the plays, though not always, as

Cynthia (Vol. iv, p. 159, line 29), and *Magnetic Lady* (Vol. vi, p. 593, line 60). The textual evidence is for the abbreviated form. *Eremore* (p. 174, line 172) was a possible form in Ben's day, but it appears as *e'remore* on editorial authority. *Cause* (p. 174, line 174) also was then written without the apostrophe and so appears in the early texts. Though apparently the Folio is followed for *Hymenaei*, the Quarto is called "authoritative"; from it comes *musique* instead of *masque* (p. 239, line 876); the meaning seems to favor *masque*, and author's corrections may appear in otherwise inaccurate editions. In *Time Vindicated* "the Folio text has a few touches of revision" (p. 651), yet the Quarto is followed in reading *Time* instead of *Fame* (p. 655, line 5). The editors allow *Fame* as possible, but think it a "printer's alteration" (p. 651) and otherwise give reasons against it. On the other side it may be said that a character on appearing naturally announces who he is, and that (p. 656) line 19, "Whence come you?" loses its point if the speaker has already said he comes from Time. The form *Britaine* does occur (e. g., p. 334, line 376) but more frequent is *Brittaine*, emended to *Brit[t]aine* (e. g., p. 742, line 214) against the evidence of the early texts. Similar are *Ham[m]ilton* (p. 743, line 226) and Ben's own name, *Jo[h]nson* (e. g., p. 749). *Vegitals* (p. 414, line 165) is a seventeenth century form, found in the Folios, but altered to *vegetals* by the editors. In p. 465, line 73 the reading *it were* is rejected for Gifford's characteristic emendation *'twere*; the original seems better. In p. 470, line 229 *to* is inserted, as Whalley suggested; is it necessary? At p. 581, line 486, the line reads *A young one is but his shade*, according to all texts. This is emended by making *one* into *one[s]*. A simpler emendation is to drop *is*. For *Augures* the Folio text is "revised and enlarged," "touched up too in minor points" (p. 626); hence the editors have followed it, yet still "correcting it from the Quarto" (p. 627). An instance is the insertion of *very* in (p. 630) line 28. Correction is sometimes demanded, but might have been more sparing.

Changes are sometimes made in the punctuation, often by adding commas. Sometimes these are demanded by present custom, though they are not indispensable even now, as well as not required in Jonson's day. In some instances they are inserted in the texts in passages where the usage of the texts suggests that Ben did not employ them. An instance is in such a form as *Peace, my wantons* (p. 345, line 89); I have noted the following passages involving similar direct address in which commas have been inserted without textual authority: p. 191, line 300; p. 251, line 72; p. 261, line 381; p. 326, line 111; p. 350, line 256; p. 366, line 228; p. 377, line 2; p. 381, line 144; p. 423, line 77; p. 423, line 79; p. 464, line 44; p. 480, line 29; p. 515, line 79; p. 630, line 15; p. 631, line 43; p. 631, line 50; p. 631, line 53; p. 632, line 81;

p. 632, line 95; p. 633, line 116; p. 759, line 283. Other marks of punctuation, such as the hyphen, are supplied with some freedom.

Yet it should not be thought that an editor must never emend. Probably to be welcomed are p. 522, line 303; p. 713, line 174; p. 722, line 437 (*Anticyra*); p. 742, line 200. Possibly emendations should also have been made in p. 466, line 93, by changing the first *the* to *that*, and in p. 479, line 16, by changing the first *y^e* to *y^t*; the facsimile of the ms. of *Pleasure Reconciled* reproduced in the volume shows the error of transcribing *y^e* instead of *y^t* in (p. 489), line 285.

In addition to showing the editors' departures from the basic texts, the textual notes give a selection of readings from other texts. Probably the reasons governing their choice will appear in the essay on the text in a later volume. They serve by sample to give some notion of what the other texts are; possibly they so justify themselves. By collating the Haddington masque I find that the spellings of the Quarto and its use of capitals are not recorded; punctuation in the Quarto unlike that of the Folio generally is noted, though in two hundred lines six instances are unrecorded. Much the same thing is true of the *Golden Age*. Apparently the reader should draw from the textual notes no inferences about the procedure of the editors except that each note seemed to them individually worth giving. Peculiarities in the Quartos are not always recorded; for example, the first *is* of p. 259, line 249, note a, is *it* in the Quarto. Letters rather than asterisks indicate the notes in the early part of *Haddington*.

The departures from the early texts tend in the direction of making Jonson seem normal to persons little used to seventeenth-century texts. But how many readers of these volumes will be unwilling to cope with the punctuation of that century? Such unwilling ones will find difficult the volumes as they are. It would have been possible to take the best text and reproduce it exactly, except for the correction of flagrant and misleading blunders by printer or copyist; all departures from the version selected, even to punctuation, could appear in textual notes; brackets or the like in the text would be allowable, though not indispensable. This would have assured the reader that he had before him, except as indicated, what he could have had in the seventeenth century, and would have reduced the number of textual notes. In fact, since important textual problems are few, the editors might even have considered expanding the textual material given in the introductions to the individual masques (e. g., pp. 79, 476-8, 626), and repeated in the footnotes; they could then have dispensed with footnotes. It was necessary to carry through complete collation, but was it necessary to print so much of its results?

But when one considers all the accurate work in the volume, objections seem slight and almost carping. The task has been so

well done that lovers of Jonson's masques can feel that they are closer than ever before to what the poet actually wrote, probably as close as they can hope to be.

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

Marlowe's "Tamburlaine." A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy. By ROY W. BATTENHOUSE. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1941. Pp. xiv + 266. \$2.50.

Raleigh and Marlowe. A Study in Elizabethan Fustian. By ELEANOR GRACE CLARK. New York: Fordham University Press, 1941. Pp. x + 488. \$4.00.

The Poems of George Chapman. Edited by PHYLLIS BROOKS BARTLETT. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1941. Pp. xii + 488. \$5.00.

These three books reflect the varied kinds of interest shown in recent years in the writings of Marlowe and members of the Marlowe circle. Dr. Battenhouse describes, for the illumination of *Tamburlaine*, the intellectual background of the play; Dr. Clark investigates Elizabethan drama, especially Marlowe's plays, as the record of public events and private quarrels; Dr. Bartlett has prepared a useful, scholarly edition of the poems of George Chapman, sometimes credited with occupying the role of philosophical spokesman of the Marlowe group.

Dr. Battenhouse applies to the interpretation of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* a close study of Elizabethan religion and morality and of the purposes of Elizabethan literature. For the romantic interpretation which sees in *Tamburlaine* a Renaissance hero whose tragedy is that he falls short of his aspirations, Dr. Battenhouse would substitute the "typical Renaissance notion of tragedy," that it "deals with the fall (not the falling short) of men, and that the tragic fall is both a consequence and a punishment of sin" (p. 17). Biographical problems are touched upon lightly, but with the expressed hope that the study of such problems may benefit by the results of the present investigation. The book, presented in two parts of about equal length, opens with a statement of the problem of interpretation and proceeds in Part I, the "Background of *Tamburlaine*," to a survey of the religious and ethical thought of the time, with special chapters on the religion of Raleigh and of Chapman. Part II, the "Anatomy of *Tamburlaine*," applies to the interpretation of the play the conclusions of Part I, and draws upon the additional aid of a study of the sources and of Elizabethan means of character portrayal.

The result of Dr. Battenhouse's study is to give *Tamburlaine* a

place among the "mirror" works which edified the Elizabethan public, a place indicated for it in the brief prologue to the play. Consequently, the importance of the Second Part of *Tamburlaine*, generally condemned as an unhistorical, patchwork sequel in which the author was rapidly losing interest, is enhanced. In the Second Part, Tamburlaine suffers, in retribution for his crimes, psychological torments which, no less than material disasters, are God's punishment of the wicked, even though the wicked be called the "Scourge of God." Both parts of Dr. Battenhouse's study combine to illuminate not only his general thesis but also many incidental passages bearing upon the interpretation of character or of action.

In the "Background of *Tamburlaine*," Dr. Battenhouse exaggerates the degree to which Elizabethan moral philosophy gained the ascendancy over dogmatic theology. Briefly, there are three points on which some shift in emphasis in reading the evidence may be desirable. (1) The "rational" approach to many questions of religion is conditioned by the circumstances of writing and does not preclude the primacy of faith. The religious writers cited by Dr. Battenhouse tell us that they use the rational approach because it is the "common ground" (p. 31) of believers and non-believers, and includes "principles common to both sides" (p. 32). The general thesis of many attacks on "atheists" is that an appeal to faith is useless; we must beat these fellows with weapons from their own armory: reason, the writings of the great philosophers, and the common experience of mankind. (2) The use of classical authorities, as Dr. Battenhouse says, is of ancient standing; Raleigh and Milton, for example, cite the authority of St. Paul and the church fathers for the use of pagan sources. Although the use of classical authorities increased greatly in extent and prestige, I believe that Dr. Battenhouse overstates the case when he writes (p. 49): "In theory the hierarchical subordination of classical culture to Christian revelation still holds; but in practice the importance of the classical is magnified, and fundamental Christian concepts tend to be defined from the standpoint of Seneca and Plato." (3) The emphasis upon Raleigh's appeal to reason in matters of religion may be misleading if we neglect Raleigh's constant appeal to scripture, always his chief authority. Where the scripture is silent, he turns to reason; where reason and scripture conflict, reason must yield to the word of God. Another possibly misleading statement is that Raleigh "makes no mention of the role of Christ in revealing God" (p. 59), because nature and philosophy suffice to establish the truth of God's existence. This comparative neglect ("no mention" is a bit strong) is offset by the fact that Raleigh takes for granted Christ's role in the revelation of God and in the scheme of salvation,—witness Raleigh's statements of faith in the *History of the World*, and his chapter on law and the laws. Although differences of opinion on the points cited resolve themselves largely into questions of degree, without material effect upon

the main thesis of the book, they are worth noting because the "Background of *Tamburlaine*" stands independently as a study of Elizabethan religious and ethical thought.

Dr. Battenhouse makes intelligent use of his source materials in interpreting *Tamburlaine*. His method inevitably tends to take the play out of the hustle and bustle of the playhouse into the quiet of the study, and in a few details (e. g., *Tamburlaine's* speech to his sons, p. 256) one may feel that enthusiasm for moral interpretation is complicating simple dramatic statement. The book is highly successful in its purpose of presenting *Tamburlaine* in the moral perspective of its own time and, incidentally, in giving a check to too facile autobiographical interpretation.

Dr. Clark's book consists of a revised reprint of her *Elizabethan Fustian* (1937) and of new material on Raleigh and Marlowe which comprises more than half the volume. Part I attempts a synthesis of studies of topical and allegorical uses of Elizabethan drama; and Part II extends the study to Marlowe's plays as vehicles for expressing the views of the so-called "School of Night." Dr. Clark's professed method is sound: she would restrict her synthesis to the considered opinions of reputable scholars, and she would present new finds as "possibilities," not as proved conclusions. The "possibilities" of Part II include readings of *Doctor Faustus* as a reminder to the audience of the career of Bruno (though not as a dramatization of his career); of *Tamburlaine* as suggestive of Raleigh's designs for New World conquests; and of the *Jew of Malta* as conveying something of the anti-Spanish and anti-papal feeling of the age.

The disarming professions of conservatism in method are, however, too often forgotten in the enthusiasm of the chase. The spirit of Dr. Clark's book is indicated by a small sketch on the flyleaf, showing human figures (three stories tall) standing atop an Elizabethan building and eagerly scanning the heavens. Below this sketch is a legend (misquoted): "Black is the Badge of Hell and the School of Night." Dr. Clark writes (p. 62) that the task of finding topical clues and giving them adequate literary and esthetic interpretation involves "not only the careful excavation of political and social data, but a kind of literary instinct as well." Many a reader will be inclined to echo Prince Hal's ". . . i' faith; I lack some of thy instinct."

Of specific difficulties in the way of following Dr. Clark in her explanation of topicalities, only a few can be mentioned here. First is the use of "fustian" as a term to include topical allusions, allegory, and even undisguised stage presentations of current problems. An extension of the definitions of the term "fustian" to include meanings described by Dr. Clark here and in an article in the *Shakespeare Association Bulletin* (January, 1939) may be in order; but only semantic confusion, leading to chaos in interpretation, can result from the indiscriminate application of one

term to diverse methods of bringing current events on the stage. Evidence of one kind of stage presentation or of one kind of allegory is not directly transferable to another kind; but Dr. Clark's book covers everything from *Mother Goose* to Shakespeare. A second difficulty is the careless reading of evidence. A writer's disclaimer of allegorical intent is for Dr. Clark proof positive of the contrary. Are there no instances of disclaimers made in good faith? Some errors in the use of evidence are traceable to simple misreading. "Buffoone" is taken to be the *proper* name of the Falstaff character in later versions of the play (pp. 253, 255). Line 187 of *Colin Clouts* is read as if Raleigh, not Cynthia, were the antecedent of "whose," with the result (p. 317) that it "sounds as if Raleigh had commissioned Spenser to write something." Several kinds of error occur in the use of one passage (p. 263): Lord Hunsdon "upon Thursday, 6 May, feasted him [Vereiken] and made him very great, and a delicate dinner, and there in the After Noone his Plaiers acted, before Veriken, Sir John Old Castell, to his great Contentment." The date should be 6 March. "His contentment" means, for Dr. Clark, Hunsdon's contentment, not the guest's! "His players" means the Lord Admiral's Men, not the players of Hunsdon, Lord Chamberlain. Indeed, according to Dr. Clark, Hunsdon patronized for six years a company of players hostile to himself and his friends; and also in the contrary camp is Thomas Nashe (p. 359), who devoted several pages, especially in *The Terrors of the Night*, to the praises of Sir George Carey (later Lord Hunsdon) and of his family, with whom he had lived in the Isle of Wight. A third difficulty involves bibliographical and typographical errors; the late Professor H. S. V. Jones appears as Miss Harriet (pp. 259, 320 *et passim*); matters referred to as "already" discussed appear after such references (pp. 59 and 73; 105 and 124); and misprints are frequent. On pages 115 and 219 we read that fustian or topicality in the drama was the rule rather than the exception; on page 223, "There are many more steps to be taken, however, . . . before it can be asserted that topicality was the rule rather than the exception." Among works which are highly pertinent to diverse subjects discussed but which do not appear in Dr. Clark's notes are F. R. Johnson's *Astronomical Thought in Renaissance England*, Mark Eccles's *Christopher Marlowe in London*, and E. C. Wilson's *England's Eliza*.

The value of Dr. Clark's study lies in the evidence amassed, rather than in the interpretation. Her book is the product of enthusiasm and industry and will furnish the reader with interesting out-of-the-way information. It is not, however, a book for the unwary or the uninitiated.

Dr. Bartlett's edition of Chapman, the first of the minor poems

since 1875, includes all his occasional verses, a few pieces of prose related to the poetry, the introductory verses to the translations of Homer, and eight poems omitted from Shepherd's edition. The reprinting of Marlowe's portion of *Hero and Leander* gives the reader the convenience of the complete text of the poem.

The introduction, only sixteen pages in length, contains a shrewd estimate of Chapman as a poet, both in his historical setting and from the point of view of modern criticism. Chapman's theory of inspiration, his desire for readers gifted with the inner light necessary to perceive poetic truth, his deliberate resort to difficult statement, his use of irrelevant conceits "to delay the moment of making a decisive statement," his efforts (in Eliot's phrase) to recreate his thought into feeling, and his disparagement of his own verse under the overpowering inspiration of Homer are briefly and effectively described. In summary (p. 15), Dr. Bartlett calls Chapman "a humanist, primarily interested in man and right conduct, who believes the good life to be the great prerequisite for art and who relies on classic, or neo-classic, doctrines for moral aid; in wit, he is a poet of the seventeenth-century metaphysical school, who naturally delights in expressing his convictions through devious figures of speech."

In those parts which I have checked with the original editions, the text proves to be clearly and accurately printed. Sixty-eight pages of textual notes and commentary, profiting by the studies of Professor Schoell and others, offer valuable help for the study of Chapman's difficult poems. The notes are compact and to the point. On controversial questions of interpretation, Dr. Bartlett usually limits her editorial practice to a noncommittal recognition of opinion; but she does not hesitate to reject (p. 437) such speculations as that Marlowe had asked Chapman to finish *Hero and Leander*. The few misprints which I have noted are not serious: p. 428, line 6, should read "then they"; and there is some confusion in the textual notes for p. 357, lines 166, 167. The book is a valuable addition to a Renaissance library and a particular aid to students of the diversified poetry of the period of transition from Elizabeth to James.

ERNEST A. STRATHMANN

Pomona College

Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig. Edited by BALDWIN MAXWELL, W. D. BRIGGS, FRANCIS R. JOHNSON, and E. N. S. THOMPSON. Stanford University Press, 1941. Pp. viii + 339. \$3.50.

This is an excellent *festschrift*. It does great honor to the scholar for whom it was assembled. Besides a bibliography of Craig's

writings and a short introductory biography, the volume contains thirty-one essays. Their range is so wide that a reader will derive a surprisingly complete perspective of the English renaissance. I discuss each essay in the sequence in which it appears. In "The York Play of *Christ Led Up to Calvary*," Mendal G. Frampton, with remarkably subtle methods but with conspicuously just treatment of available evidence, makes out a good case for extensive revision of xxxiv of the York Cycle. George R. Coffman's "The Miracle Play: Notes and Queries" is a valuable corrective to those who simplify the origin of genres; the complexities of the age, their interactions, individual genius which in sudden artistic achievement seems to belie the assumption of evolution—all these are pertinent. A rambling but interesting little paper is B. L. Ullman's "Some Aspects of Italian Humanism." Its primary importance is its insistence that the early Renaissance employment of the classics was different in kind from that of the Middle Ages. Ullman breaks ground in stressing the influence of fourteenth century French humanism on the Italian burgeoning. Allan H. Gilbert's "Fortune in the Tragedies of Giraldis Canticus" is required reading for all students of Renaissance tragedy. Crossing the view of Fortune as an irrational, malevolent force was the Christian idea of justice. The dramatist's dilemma was further complicated by the influence of Seneca, Aristotle, and "l'uso dei nostri tempi" (tragicomedy). In "Fracastoro and the Imagination," Murray W. Bundy shows that this many-sided humanist differed from all Renaissance theorists in his conception of the imagination and anticipated the romantic critics. There is an interesting sidelight on Shakespeare's use of the term in *M. N. D.*, v, i, 2-8. Hoyt H. Hudson's "Current English Translations of *The Praise of Folly*" is a prolegomenon to his own recently published translation. In showing the deficiencies of Wilson and Kennett's versions, Hudson does justice to the subtlety, grace, and wit of the great Dutchman.

Because of the work of Professor M. P. Tilley and his scholarly colleagues, we are now aware of the ease and fecundity with which proverb lore flowed from the pens of Shakespeare's age. Archer Taylor's "The Proverb *The Black Ox Has Not Trod On His Foot* in Renaissance Literature" traces the permutations of the proverb in English literature and offers continental parallels. Taylor seems to agree that as yet a wholly satisfactory theory of origin can not be presented. "Aspects of Spenser's Vocabulary" by the late Professor Padelford indicates that Spenser was a master in coining new words; to him we owe such necessary terms as *blatant*, *daedal*, *equipage*, *lucid*, *pallid*, and *penurious*. Edwin Casady's "The Neo-Platonic Ladder in Spenser's *Amoretti*" contains an admirable summary of the steps which the lover must go through in his

progress toward ideal love—as revealed by Pico della Mirandola and Bembo; but the specific application to the *Amoretti* is not convincing. In his entertaining “Greene’s Panther,” John Leo Lievsay follows Don Cameron Allen in illustrating how lazy and trite Greene was in citations from “unnatural history.” Although he employed the beast many times for didactic purposes, he merely repeated a few scraps from the traditional repertory. He could have utilized for his moralizing accessible material in Aristotle and Pliny—as did Nashe. Paul H. Kocher in “Backgrounds for Marlowe’s Atheist Lecture” has amply illustrated that Baine’s memorandum contains a designed attack on Christianity and that its points imply a wide knowledge not only of scripture but also of contemporary, patristic, and pagan writings on the subject. But Kocher has not proved his main thesis that Marlowe was serious—that he was being more than a sophisticated *enfant terrible*.

“*The Taming of A Shrew*” by Henry David Gray sets forth the hypotheses that *A Shrew* is a bad quarto derived from *The Shrew* before the latter was revised, that the thief was the actor of the Tailor and one of Petruchio’s servants, and that he was neither Birde nor Rowley. It seems to me that Gray (like Sykes and Wilson) reaches the top of dizzy heights before he has climbed the necessary individual steps. Baldwin Maxwell’s “*The Two Angry Women of Abington and Wily Beguiled*” is a shining example of how the Sykes-Oliphant method of author determination can be played fairly. After going thoroughly into the striking similarities between Porter’s drama and *Wily*, Maxwell comes out with the verdict *not proved*. And one applauds the care and integrity that led to this conclusion. By analyzing the prologue to Dekker’s *If It Be Not Good, the Devil Is in It*, in “Aims of a Popular Elizabethan Dramatist,” George F. Reynolds shows that just as the pseudo-classical Jonson had his conscious program, so too did such a successful romantic dramatist as Dekker. Lush poetry, rapid audience responses, scenes in which the actor could tear a passion to tatters, the variety and contrast of tragicomedy—these are what Dekker and his fellows strove to give the ticket-purchasers. J. W. Ashton’s “The Fall of Icarus” indicates that the spirit of scientific inquiry in the sixteenth century was met by deep-seated fears that such pursuit was outside the proper limits set by God. E. P. Kuhl’s “Shakespeare’s *Rape of Lucrece*” endeavours to show that *Lucrece* was purposefully of political significance to Elizabethan readers. His case is weak.

In “Perseus Purloins Pegasus,” T. W. Baldwin writes that by the Middle Ages Perseus had taken over Bellerophon’s steed; Shakespeare and his contemporaries followed the tradition, probably because of illustrated editions of the *Metamorphoses*. George Coffin Taylor has “Two Notes on Shakespeare.” The first shows

that Shakespeare in *King Lear* (I, ii, 111-145) was aware of contemporary controversy as to the worth of astrological prognostication. (Taylor might have pointed out that Don John in *Much Ado*, I, iii, 11 ff. espouses Gloucester's side and that Cassius in *J. C.* I, ii, 139-41 takes Edmund's.) In his second note, Taylor proves that a passage in *A Shrew* is borrowed from DuBartas—and thus adds to the list of known pilferings in this mysterious compost. Virgil K. Whitaker's "Shakespeare's Use of his Sources" is a superb essay. It rises above its immediate subject into a profound grasp of Shakespeare's art. It is the prize of the volume—and as important criticism on the bard as has ever been written. In "Shakespeare as a Critic" H. T. Price attempts to show how by subject matter and by parody—sometimes broad, sometimes subtle—Shakespeare attacked various conventions of his day. Carroll Camden's "The Mind's Construction in the Face" deals with Elizabethan interest in two pseudo-sciences: physiognomy, determination of character from the face; metoposcopy, determination of character and fortune from the lines in the forehead. The dramatists were aware of these methodologies.

Madeleine Doran's "*That Undiscovered Country*, A Problem Concerning the Use of the Supernatural in *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*" is a highly abstruse, carefully thought out, and exceedingly literate paper. She suggests that Elizabethans' awe in the face of the supernatural on the stage was different in kind from ours: they believed in the marvelous or regarded it as possible; we temporarily suspend disbelief for the sake of imaginative enjoyment. "Comedy in the Court Masque: A Study of Ben Jonson's Contribution," by T. M. Parrott, gives more than the title promises. It is a miniature but thorough history of the masque, indicating in particular how it developed under Jonson's genius. In "John Ford and Elizabethan Tragedy," G. F. Sensabaugh shows that Ford's tragedy was different in kind from Shakespeare's. In the latter is free will; in the former, a mechanistic psychology plus an insistence that the demands of love were superior to convention created a conflict in which society was the villain. Elbert N. S. Thompson's "Richard Hooker among the Controversialists," by comparison with earlier and later writers, illustrates Hooker's handling of important controversial issues: the nature of divine law, episcopacy, royal authority, multiple livings, etc. In a rather clumsily written paper, "The Myth of John Donne the Rake," A. R. Benham attacks the Gosse theory that Donne's poems were autobiographical; rather, they were inventions deliberately written in a spirit that protested against the prevalent saccharine modes. George Reuben Potter in "A Protest against the Term *Conceit*," traces the history of the word in England, marks how contemporary praise of the metaphysical school has led to muddled denotation,

and requests an exact terminology that can be applied to all varieties of poetic imagery. In "The Theme of Pre-Existence and Infancy in *The Retreat*," Merritt Y. Hughes rescues Vaughan from the Cabbalists (for this much thanks!) and relates the poem to Christian theology by an examination of what the classic, medieval, and contemporary writers had to say on the given themes. In "A Note on Two Words in Milton's *History of Muscovia*," Harris Fletcher writes a paper mainly of interest to lexicographers—since Milton (as his margins tell us) got the first from Hakluyt and the second from Purchas and since it seems quite clear that the poet knew no more of each word than his source informed him. In Kemp Malone's "Grundtvig on *Paradise Lost*," we learn that the Danish critic conceived of an epic as presenting a great historical event in which good conquered evil and that he considered Milton had failed because he had chosen the fall of man as his theme. Of interest is Grundtvig's notion that Milton was at fault in making his symbolism give rise to particular personages and acts instead of making his symbolism grow out of the particulars. "The English Religious Restoration, 1660-1665," by Harry G. Plum, suggests that the Puritan movement was far more vital than is realized in the period named. Repressive legislation only tended to strengthen it.

LEO KIRSCHBAUM

St. Louis University

Shakespeare's Audience. By ALFRED HARBAGE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. ix + 201. \$2.25.

This is a series of familiar essays on the general theme of *Shakespeare's Audience*. The first essay, *The Evidence*, exhibits some of the more spectacular pronouncements of Shakspeare's contemporaries to the conclusion that "So long as we remember that the points of view of our witnesses are not necessarily our own and that the social and satirical and even moral overtones in their voices no longer concern us, we should listen attentively to every word. Many voices will be heard in the following pages. Some passages are a reticulation of contemporary utterances. Others bristle with ugly statistics. I beg pardon for all and submit a warning: it will baffle us still—that stream of men and women which melted long ago into the lengthening shadows of Southwark." As one who has contributed no little to "ugly statistics," the reviewer asks no pardon for himself, and feels certain that he speaks for most of the other modern culprits. He is equally certain that those of Shakspeare's day would hold the same opinions still toward what they conceived to be the same facts, for the same "social and satirical and even moral overtones in their voices" are

still with us, and must "concern us" now in these stern days more than ever. All would and will reserve the right to hold their own opinions on the facts; it is a clearer knowledge of the facts which is really needed, not an exhibition of some amusing paradoxes of opinion, which may not in truth be so amusing as the author seems to think.

In the second essay, *How Many People?*, we are told that "What follows is a series of computations culminating in a guess. My only claim is that it is the most thoughtful guess thus far made." The computations were made by "An electrical calculating machine and patience," but we are usually given only the results and have no effective means of checking the author's adventures in "a realm made dismal by arithmetic." Those who have come to grips with Henslowe's lack of habit in bookkeeping will know that a great deal of analytical and interpretive work yet needs to be done before statistical methods can safely be applied, even if only "culminating in a guess." As a sample of the pitfalls, it might be pertinent to ask Professor Harbage how any one knows that it was 1 *Henry VI* which appears in Henslowe's Diary and only the first part, since he interprets total receipts from *Henry VI* to bolster one of Nashe's enthusiastic statements and to play an important rôle elsewhere. This is merely symptomatic of the fundamental difficulties involved but apparently unseen by the author. Professor Harbage is content to pile eclectically one secondary authority on another—Ossa on Pelion. This may be satisfactory for a familiar essay, but the scholar will wish something more.

The "guess" at which the "electrical calculating machine and patience" arrive is "About 2,500 a day or 15,000 a week in 1595, about 3,000 a day or 18,000 a week in 1601, about 3,500 a day or 21,000 a week in 1605—this is my conjecture of average theatrical attendance in Shakespeare's day." This is apparently upward of twice what the reviewer was and is prepared to admit as an average in his less "thoughtful guess thus far made." Indeed, the author himself says, "I suspect that my estimate of theatrical attendance will seem too high and my estimate of the population of London too low." He manages to send about 13% of London's population to the theater in 1605, though he admits that even that is "apathetic" in comparison with the 65% estimated attendance nowadays at the movies. Incidentally, one supposes it must have been the "electrical calculating machine" and certainly not the "patience" which managed to get the lines attributed to Leonard Digges in the *Poems* of 1640 inserted in the First Folio, leading to the most interesting conclusion that "When Leonard Digges contributed these lines to the First Folio, he was writing commendatory verse, and such verse is often justly suspect. But Ben Jonson also contributed verses to the volume, and it was

Jonson's audience that Digges used for comparison: it was tactless enough for Digges to make and the publishers to print such a comparison, not to mention what it would have been unless undeniably true." Even in 1623 it probably would not have been physically safe to be so tactless with Ben, however "undeniably true" the comparison may have been; at any rate, no one was so tactless. However "undeniably true" the conclusion itself is, it rests on false facts, through a confusion of secondary sources. One would feel safer if Professor Harbage showed more first-hand knowledge of the field he is here working.

Succeeding essays on (3) *What Kind of People?*, (4) *Behavior*, (5) *Quality: Elizabethan Appraisals*, (6) *Quality: Modern Appraisals*, (7) *Our Shakespeares and Our Audiences* further exploit the supposedly amusing paradoxes of opinions, the final essay being the author's own confessed "personal indulgence," as in fact the others have also unintentionally to a considerable extent been. The reader may find some rather amusing specimens, but *de gustibus!*

T. W. BALDWIN

University of Illinois

The Complete Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. The New Cambridge Edition. Edited with introduction and notes by WILLIAM ALLAN NELSON and CHARLES JARVIS HILL. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1942. Pp. xxviii + 1420. \$5.00.

The revised edition of the Cambridge edition of Shakespeare will probably not be received with the high acclaim that was accorded the original edition. Unlike its predecessor, it does not hold the field alone, for at least one other good one-volume edition of Shakespeare is in existence, and still others are known to be in preparation. And unlike its predecessor it fails to provide consistently adequate and authoritative introductions and summaries of scholarship for the plays and poems. The editors tell us, for example, that their text of *2 Henry IV* is based on the first and only quarto (of 1600), with interpolations from the text of the First Folio; but they fail to observe that sheet E of the 1600 quarto was partly reset to permit the inclusion of Act III, Scene 1 (108 lines), which had at first been omitted, with the result that in its later state this gathering consists of six leaves instead of the normal number, four (the first state may be designated Qa; the second, Qb). Nor do they mention that, according to M. A. Bayfield and to Professor Shaaber (see the latter's *Variorum* ed., p. 476), "the compositor who set up E₃-E₆ in Qb 'probably set up [the end of

II, iv and the beginning of III, ii] from a print of his own faulty pages [in Qa] rather than from the manuscript," with the result that Qa is "the only authoritative text for so much of the play as was printed on these leaves." These editorial omissions are due either to negligence or to oversimplification. To cite another illustration, the treatment of *1 Henry IV* is equally unsatisfactory. No mention whatever is made of the fragmentary first quarto of this play, which Hemingway has denominated Q_o; and Q 1603 (New Cambridge Shakespeare, p. 632, column 1) is a bibliographical ghost of the editors' own creating. Students of Shakespeare are likely to be misled by the statement (p. 632) that "Shakespeare is careful to keep the Prince's wildness within limits, however disreputable his associates," which completely ignores the implications of I, ii, 54 ff. The comments on Prince Hal's soliloquy at the end of I, ii lack historical perspective, and the discussion of Falstaff's courage is much too subtle for elementary students, ignoring, as it does, the fact that Falstaff's disquisition on Honour is simply one of the variations—a sophisticated one—on the central theme of the play.

"The manuscript," we are told (p. 179), "from which the Quarto [of *Much Ado*] was set up was the theatrical prompt-copy," as is proved by the presence in the text of the names of Kempe and Cowley. This statement takes no account of the arguments of McKerrow and others that these names are strong contributory evidence that the printer's copy was Shakespeare's own manuscript, not a theatrical text prepared with normalized speech-tags for prompt use. In the enumeration of the sources of the play there is no mention of the analogues in Peter Beverly and George Whetstone recently pointed out by C. T. Prouty.

One other instance must suffice to show the failure of the introductory sections to include the latest findings of Shakespearean investigators. *The Passionate Pilgrim* is said to be "a small piratical octavo printed for William Jaggard in 1599. Of the second edition no copy is known for certain to have survived, although a unique fragment of what may be the second edition is bound up with a copy of the first now in the Folger Library" (p. 1402). The second sentence could hardly have been penned had the writer examined with care the facsimile of the Folger *Passionate Pilgrim* or Dr. J. Q. Adams's introduction to the volume, in which he describes the peculiarities of the original and conclusively demonstrates the priority of the Folger fragment.

Sections of the text which I have collated are generally accurate; to certain others exception must be taken. Thus the text of *Titus Andronicus* is based on the First Quarto; but the editors depart from this basic text without justification in the wording of the text or of the stage directions at IV, ii; V, iii, 25; and V, iii, 60.

At i, i, 35 they similarly omit some lines present in Q 1 which were lost in Q 2, Q 3, and F 1; and at v, iii, 200 they add four lines from Q 2 which possess absolutely no authority.

The book is clearly printed. Every user will be grateful for the inclusion of Ben Jonson's magnificent tribute "To the Memory of my Beloved, the Author, Mr. William Shakespeare."

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

Folger Shakespeare Library

The Eighteenth Century Background. Studies on the Idea of Nature in the Thought of the Period. By BASIL WILLEY. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Chatto and Windus, 1941. Pp. viii + 302. \$3.25.

In spite of its main title, this volume is not, its author is careful to explain, intended as "a history of eighteenth century thought." It may most accurately be described as an inquiry into the modes of thought, feeling, and taste connected, in that period, with the word "nature." One cannot, indeed, properly speak of "the idea of Nature," since, as Mr. Willey is well aware, the term more or less confusedly expressed dozens of quite different ideas; and as there were few subjects of possible discourse which were not, in that century, connected with, or subsumable under, that term, in one or another of its senses, the nominally narrower theme indicated by the subtitle is, or might be, almost coextensive with the larger one which the author disclaims. His book is, however, chiefly concerned with the normative conceptions connoted by "nature" in British ethics and literary theory and practice, in political doctrines and in religion, and with the influence upon these of ideas about the general attributes of "nature" in the sense of the physical world or the cosmical order. These topics are for the most part presented in the form of connected expositions of the thought of particular major authors: Shaftesbury, Butler, Mandeville, Swift, Hume, Hartley, Priestley, Godwin, and Burke. There is a chapter on Holbach, the only French writer dealt with at all fully; and the book concludes with an especially noteworthy chapter on "'Nature' in Wordsworth."

As separate expository and critical essays these chapters have a value of their own, apart from their relation to the author's central theme; for though the subjects are well-worn, Mr. Willey usually has fresh and penetrating observations to make upon them. But what gives the book a more than chronological unity and a distinctive place among works on its period is the attempt to analyze, through all these special topics and phases of eighteenth-century

reflection, the ideas for which "nature" was the common verbal vehicle. The "protean ambiguity" of the word is presumably by this time generally recognized. But no previous study has, I believe, illustrated so extensively its manifestations in that century, and none, perhaps, has come nearer to adequacy in discriminating the meanings of the word, in showing how notions initially attaching to it in one context or province of thought passed over into others, and in tracing the significant changes in its predominant import, in one or another province, between the beginning and end of the century.

These, however, are large and difficult undertakings, and it would be too much to say that Mr. Willey has accomplished them completely. There are several highly characteristic eighteenth-century ideas expressed by "nature" or "natural" which, though not in all cases wholly unmentioned, are insufficiently explicated, or given considerably less prominence than their relative vogue and influence would require. Primitivism, for example, and the interaction between it and the idea of progress, and the effect upon both of the new temper connected with the Industrial Revolution, receive surprisingly little attention. The same is true of Methodism and the Evangelical Movement—which are dismissed with the singularly mistaken remark that they "really belong to the reaction against all that the eighteenth century stood for" (p. 182). They are in fact closely related to tendencies which the author elsewhere recognizes as conspicuous in the later eighteenth century, such as the increasing emphasis on feeling and personal inner experience, and a more favorable view of the possibilities of human nature; and in any case, the new religious movement was an actual part of the "eighteenth century background." The reader, again, will hardly gather that the most current and important *single* connotation of "natural," through most of the century, was "universal," that is, known to, or recognized as valid by, all mankind at all times; that the uniformitarianism implicit in this sense was in constant conflict with a species of individualism or "diversitarianism" which also took "nature" as its catchword; and that the latter in the end tended to become dominant. Except in the first two chapters, dealing with the beginning of the century, and that on Wordsworth, the aspects of the subject pertinent to aesthetics and the theory of poetry are all but completely ignored—*e. g.*, the relation of the idea of the "imitation of nature" to those peculiarly English phenomena of the mid-century, the Gothic revival and the *goût anglo-chinois*.

In spite of these and other omissions, the book is indispensable for students of the period; for, not the "idea of nature," but the ideas conveyed, or concealed, by "nature," were the most pervasive and potent in eighteenth-century thought, and Mr. Willey has

notably contributed to a better understanding of many of them, of their filiation, transformations, conjunctions or oppositions, and of the total complex movement in which they played their very diverse parts.

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY

The Johns Hopkins University

The Aesthetic Theory of Thomas Hobbes, with special reference to his contribution to the psychological approach in English literary criticism. By CLARENCE DE WITT THORPE. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1940. Pp. x + 339. \$4.00. (U. of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature, XVIII.)

"Hobbes certainly made further progress toward an analysis of the mental processes related to poetry than had anyone before him, or than anyone was to do after him up to Addison and Hutcheson." Such in brief is Mr. Thorpe's conclusion, after the most careful and exhaustive analysis yet made of Hobbes as an aesthetic thinker. In view of the vast amount of evidence which Mr. Thorpe presents for the importance of Hobbes as an aesthetic thinker, it seems strange that so little has been done previously by literary historians on this subject. Only within comparatively recent times have any of the phases of Hobbes' aesthetics been treated. "*Leviathan* . . . of all his works created hugest" has concerned the philosophers, who perhaps felt it beneath the dignity of their sea-beast that he should have concerned himself with the "minor" problems of the creative art.

Mr. Thorpe indicates that Hobbes' interest in aesthetics was not a minor matter, nor a mere side-issue, but was part and parcel of his complete philosophical theory, which is largely founded in psychology. It is, indeed, the "psychological approach" in which Thorpe finds the importance of Hobbes' aesthetics. In his first and last chapters, the author shows the relationship between Hobbes, the political and ethical philosopher, and Hobbes, the psychological aesthetician, and reminds us of the fact, too frequently forgotten by philosophers, that Hobbes was a "man of letters" in his own right, and was so considered by many of his contemporaries. In his second chapter, Mr. Thorpe surveys many of Hobbes' predecessors, from Plato and Aristotle down to the seventeenth century, showing here the same judicious attitude which characterizes his work as a whole, for he is well aware that the "psychological approach" did not spring full-grown from the brain of his modern Zeus. Building upon his predecessors, Hobbes went farther than any of the others, in considering two fundamental matters: the

nature of the "creative imagination," and the "aesthetic" effect of that imagination.

Mr. Thorpe is not content with mere synthesis, and certainly not with mere generalizations. He enters carefully into close and well-wrought discussions of many of the important terms of the period: "wit," "fancy," "judgment"—as well as "imagination." He considers these terms in connection not only with Hobbes and his predecessors but his immediate successors. His chapter on Dennis, indeed, is one of the most illuminating in the book. That on Dryden, on the other hand, seems somewhat over-simplified in contrast with this. Yet in his various treatments of the possible effect of Hobbes here and elsewhere, Mr. Thorpe is always judicious. He does not pretend that Hobbes was the only possible "influence," though he does insist, with reason, that to some extent later writers such as Dennis, Addison, and Burke "worked in a psychological tradition . . . which in English criticism can be traced back for its most important impulse to Thomas Hobbes."

Because Mr. Thorpe has done so much for the assistance of other students in the field, it seems churlish to ask why he has not done more. It is probable that his own preface was intended to answer one immediate and obvious question: why is there not fuller discussion of Addison? He says that this volume was intended as a chapter in a book on Addison, yet it is disappointing to find so little reference to Addison. Mr. Thorpe has discussed in detail Bacon's ideas on specifically "aesthetic" matters; yet there is no discussion of the "idols" in connection with the "psychological approach" which developed in the seventeenth century. It is hardly enough to say that in those classic passages Bacon was not talking specifically about literature and the arts; he was discussing the psychological approach to all phases of human thinking. And should there not be a fuller discussion of Descartes, other than that implied in sporadic references?

Finally, there remains one fundamental problem: was Hobbes as much of an "aesthete" as Mr. Thorpe suggests? The author himself calls attention to the "defects and gaps in his theory"; to a certain lack of "consistency and completeness"; to Hobbes' inheritance of some of the "confusions" of ancient and mediaeval psychologists; to his failure to define fully later "conceptions of the creative imagination as the active principle in perception and artistic composition." He says that Hobbes' use of terms is often tantalizing, and that the phraseology often obscures the inner consistency of meaning. (A striking example of this is to be found in the passage from the "Answer to Davenant" quoted pp. 107-8. Does Hobbes' "phraseology" here mean as much as Mr. Thorpe reads into it, in connection with Shelley and Coleridge?) Was Hobbes as conscious of his "aesthetic" as Mr. Thorpe makes him seem to be? Did Hobbes really believe that poetry, like science and

philosophy, was ultimately a means of attaining truth, or did he not believe that science and philosophy must ever take precedence over poetry? Yet even if these criticisms are valid, they indicate only defects of Mr. Thorpe's undoubted qualities. In his enthusiasm for his subject he has perhaps read more into Hobbes' aesthetics than was really there. Which of us has not erred in the same way—if error it is? After all, the real criticism goes back beyond Mr. Thorpe to Hobbes himself. That behemoth, like his master Bacon, pretended to take all knowledge to be his province. Why should not a modern disciple feel that Hobbes was as fully master of aesthetics as of ethics and political philosophy? One question alone remains: "*Canst thou draw out Leviathan with a hook?*" Mr. Thorpe has proved himself our most able fisherman; and perhaps if the "little fishes" could talk, Hobbes' "little fishes" would really "talk like whales."!

MARJORIE NICOLSON

Columbia University

The Pennsylvania Germans. By ARTHUR D. GRAEFF, WALTER M. KOLLMORGEN, CLYDE S. STINE, RALPH WOOD, RICHARD H. SHRYOCK, ALBERT FRANKLIN BUFFINGTON, G. PAUL MUSSELMAN, HARRY HESS REICHARD. Edited by RALPH WOOD. The Princeton University Press, 1942. \$3.00.

If the Pennsylvania Germans were identical with the "Dutch," known for two centuries as the "dumb Dutch," who inhabited the fertile valleys of eastern Pennsylvania, then the general public might believe it had adequate information about them. Were they not those "plain people," the Amish and Mennonites, who had furnished various novelists with fresh and unexploited material; an isolated and clannish people, religiously superstitious, who continued to paint strange signs upon their spacious barns to keep the witches away; a curious people withal who continued to ride to meetings and markets in little carriages without dashboards and who refused to be vaccinated; who were opposed to higher education and the taking up of arms; who refused to submit to the New Deal, who would not plow their God-granted crops under nor be subsidized, in fact would not be Americanized?

For this general public *The Pennsylvania Germans* will furnish an amazing disillusionment. Under the editorship of Ralph Wood a series of chapters was prepared by specialists in their separate fields. Although each chapter is built upon extensive preliminary groundwork, the reader is spared the mustiness of academic research. The vague and phantastic notions so long held are here brushed aside and the Pennsylvania Germans emerge in their true light as the most remarkable minority group among the peoples of our great Commonwealth.

The editor warns the reader that this book is not an encyclopedia of Pennsylvania Germans. Choice of material was constantly motivated by the questions, Who are the Pennsylvania Germans, Why are they what they are, and What is their place in America? One common denominator appeared to develop spontaneously throughout the series of chapters: the Pennsylvania German character was moulded by the fact that the Pennsylvania Germans were farmers practically and spiritually. Very fittingly the editor points out that this staunch old American stock has less connection with modern Germany than New England has with England. "If America should ever go Fascist or Communist, the stubborn Pennsylvania German would be the last to fall in line."

In the initial chapter *Pennsylvania, the Colonial Melting Pot*, as well as in a later chapter *The Pennsylvania Germans as Soldiers*, Arthur D. Graeff has traced the origins of these people, their migrations to Penn's Woods, the part they played in our colonial history, their ardent participation in all the wars from the early Colonial period down to our own day and their contributions in the political, economic and cultural development of our country. He has demonstrated that they were pioneers in that synthesizing of ethnology and culture which the world today knows as Americanism.

A most original contribution is Walter M. Kollmorgen's *The Pennsylvania German Farmer*, in which he has convincingly indicated the preëminent place the Pennsylvania Germans occupy in the history and economics of our national agriculture, by a careful study of their folkways and of the ideals, motives and objectives directing their activities in the New World. The German farmer settled on his lands with the firm intention of remaining there. He and his family became a patriarchal and economic unit whose pattern rested upon the ancestral speech and upon religious and agrarian ways. Anything that encroached upon that pattern was looked upon with disfavor. His English, Scotch and Irish neighbors had aspired to higher education. It had not made them better farmers. In fact he had gradually displaced them and acquired their neglected farms. He had a different sense of values. He looked askance upon Yankee cleverness. He had perfected a way of life. It did not include the manufacture of wooden nutmegs! God had blessed his integrity, his thrift and the labor of his hands. Through his persistent adherence to an ideal all America had become his debtor.

The Sects, Apostles of Peace, written in an easy, chatty magazine style, is perhaps the most readable and the least informative of all the chapters. G. Paul Musselman, ardent protagonist of the sects, conveys to his readers their spiritual significance without giving to the uninitiated an objective presentation of their various kinds, origins and doctrinal differences.

For those who think of the Pennsylvania Germans mainly as sectarians, Ralph Wood's chapter *Lutheran and Reformed, Pennsylvania German Style*, conveys the fact that the majority of Pennsylvania Germans are members of these two churches. However, this chapter together with the previous one can hardly be said to present adequately the total religious activities of the Pennsylvania Germans. Unfortunately the second half of Wood's chapter consists largely of stories and anecdotes that have but a slight relation to the preceding material and whose spirit of satire and humor is largely obscured when lifted out of the dialect garb.

Most enlightening is Clyde S. Stine's chapter *The Pennsylvania Germans and the School*. Nowhere else will the reader find so excellent an exposition of the much misunderstood relation of these people to education. It becomes clear that at no time did the Pennsylvania Germans oppose education as such, that the history of education among them has been mainly one of a struggle between the state and the Pennsylvania German agrarian spirit. The state met opposition only when they believed their freedom of living their way of life was jeopardized. Like the Quakers they were at first opposed to public schools, not because they were opposed to education, but rather because the secularization of schools was to them a desecration. The elimination of their language, so precious to them, was a sacrilege. It was not clear to them why the English language should be the exclusive organ for the expression of the principles of American democracy.

Ralph Wood's chapter *Journalism Among the Pennsylvania Germans* is an excellent treatment of the relation of the German newspaper to the education of the Pennsylvania Germans and their agrarian philosophy of life. He emphasizes the genuine Americanism that pervades their journalism, but hardly clarifies the relation of the later New German press to the native press.

The general reader may well be astonished upon reading Harry Hess Reichard's *Pennsylvania German Literature* to find how extensive and diversified literary expression in the dialect has really been. This chapter is in the main a condensation of the writer's authoritative *Pennsylvania German Dialect Writings and Their Writers* (1918), but for additional material treating such writers who have appeared since the date of that publication.

Supplementing Reichard's chapter is A. F. Buffington's *The Pennsylvania German Dialect*, an abstract from his compendious unpublished work on the dialect. But for the introductory paragraphs, which contain much to enlighten the general reader, this chapter will appeal mainly to those who know the dialect. All will be grateful for the map indicating the distribution of the Pennsylvania Germans.

In the closing chapter *The Pennsylvania Germans as Seen by the Historian* Richard H. Shryock cleverly contradicts its title

and demonstrates that the Pennsylvania German was not seen by the historian. This chapter is an indictment of the intolerance, prejudice and lack of scholarship that has characterized most of the work of Anglo-Saxon writers of American history down to our own day with respect to the place of the Pennsylvania Germans in our national history.

The appended Bibliographical Guide, arbitrary and with many notable omissions, might well have been omitted.

This book goes a long way in correcting very erroneous concepts about the Pennsylvania Germans. Certainly it is the most comprehensive single volume yet offered to the public upon this subject.

PRESTON A. BARBA

Muhlenberg College

BRIEF MENTION

Germany's Military Heroes of the Napoleonic Era in Her Post-War Historical Drama. By HAROLD EVERETT STEARNS, JR. (Michigan Dissertation. Pittsburgh Printing Co.) 174 pp. "Roughly one-fourth of the total dramatic production in Germany since 1918 has been on historical themes, the major portion of which were naturally taken from German history." From this production are selected only those plays which are woven around the heroes of the Napoleonic era, arranged in groups according to themes, and subjected to the scrutiny of literary analysis in order to obtain a scale of value. The investigator's principal interest is, however, not the esthetic merit of the plays but their use of the historical parallelism of the two periods (that in which they were written and that which they use as material) for their specific purposes, ranging from a propaganda of war and hatred to the kindling of a lofty national consciousness. Curiously or naturally enough, these two aims characterize the hack writer as the one pole and the true dramatist as the other. It is at times a little confusing to keep the two points of view constantly in mind: traits which are rated as artistically poor and inorganic find their explanation in propagandistic effectiveness (see, for instance, the coarse sallies of Prince Louis Ferdinand on p. 63), but this antinomy is inherent in the double viewpoint of the investigation and its interest in the interrelation between dramatist and audience. Mr. Stearns, well-informed in regard to both, currents of political psychology in post-war Germany and dramatic literature and its sources, has rendered a valuable service to our knowledge of modern German drama as well as to the much neglected field of "Sociologie der literarischen Geschmacksbildung" (Schücking).

E. F.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Baldwin, T. W. — William Shakspeare's petty school. *Urbana*: U. of Illinois Press, 1943. Pp. 240. \$3.00. (Commemoration of the Seventy-fifth Year of the U. of Illinois.)

Brown, Arthur C. L. — The origin of the Grail legend. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1943. Pp. x + 476. \$5.00.

Brown, Stuart Gerry, ed. — We hold these truths. Documents of American Democracy. *New York*: Harper's, 1941. Pp. x + 351. \$1.20.

Gascoigne's, George. — A hundred sundrie flowers. Ed. C. T. Prouty. *Columbia*: U. of Missouri, 1942. Pp. 305. \$2.50. (The U. of Missouri Studies, xvii, 2.)

Greet, W. Cabell. — War words, recommended pronunciations. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, for Columbia Broadcasting System, 1943. Pp. 137. \$1.50.

Hall, Robert A., Jr. — Melanesian pidgin English, grammar, texts, vocabulary. *Baltimore*: The Waverly Press, Inc. for the Linguistic Society of America, 1943. Pp. 150.

Moody, Wm. Vaughn and Lovett, Robert Morss. — A history of English literature. New and Enlarged Edition by Fred B. Millett. *New York*: Scribner's, 1943. Pp. xii + 554. \$2.00.

Osgood, Charles Grosvenor, Lotspeich, Henry Gibbons and Dorothy E. Mason. — The works of Edmund Spenser, a variorum edition; The minor poems, vol. i. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Pp. xii + 734. \$7.50.

Parrott, Thomas Marc and Ball, Robert Hamilton. — A short view of Elizabethan drama. *New York*: Scribner's, 1943. Pp. viii + 311. \$1.80.

Stephens, G. Arbour, M. D. — New light on the Arthurian battlefields. *Haverfordwest, Wales*: Hammond & Co. Pp. 12. 6d. (Reprinted from "Swansea and West Wales Guardian.")

GERMAN

Evans, M. Blakemore. — The Passion Play of Lucerne, An Historical and Critical Introduction. [MLA Monograph Series, XIV]. *New York*: The Modern Language Association of America, 1943. xi, 245 pp.

Frank, Bruno. — Zwölf tausend. Schauspiel in drei Akten und Nina, Komödie in drei Akten. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary by Anthony Scenna. *Bos-*

ton: Houghton Mifflin Co. [1943]. xvi, 195 pp. \$1.60.

Pusey, W. W., and Steer, A. G. — Readings in Military German, Selected and edited. With Concise German Grammar and Vocabulary by B. Q. Morgan. *Boston*: D. C. Heath & Co. [1943]. viii, 316 pp. \$1.50.

Wooley, Elmer Otto. — Studies in Theodor Storm [Indiana Univ. Publications, Humanities Series No. 10]. *Bloomington, Ind.*: Univ. Bookstore, 1943. 143 pp. \$1.00.

FRENCH

Baudelaire. — El joven encantador; Historia sacada de un palimpsesto de Pompeya, trad. de F. Pujula, precedida de un estudio sobre B. por J. Raimundo Bartres. *Barcelona*: Ed. Pal Las Bartes, 1941. 94 pp.

Cailliet, E. — La Tradition littéraire des idéologues. Introd. by G. Chinard. *Philadelphia*: Am. Philosophical Soc., 1943. xxii + 322 pp. (Memoirs, 19.)

Cru, A. L. and Guinnard, A. — Le français moderne. *New York*: Macmillan, 1942. xxii + 532 pp. \$1.80.

Denoeu, François. — Military French. *Boston*: Heath, 1943. xii + 355 pp. \$1.75.

Dubois, Aline. — Les lettres de mon amie, ed. E. I. Edwards. *New York*: Macmillan, 1942. ix + 216 pp. \$1.60.

Dumas. — Le comte de Monte-Cristo, ed. A. G. Bovée. *New York*: Harper, 1942. x + 435 pp. \$1.28.

— Three Musketeers, ed. V. Angelo. *Yonkers*: World Bk. Co., 1942. 740 pp. \$0.59.

Errante, Guido. — Sulla Lirica Romanza delle origini. *New York*: Vanni, 1943. 440 pp.

Jeanneret, F. C. A. — Pour lire avec plaisir. *Boston*: Heath [1942]. xii + 186 pp. \$1.20.

Kirby, F. G. and Frederick, W. H. — Lectures choisies. *Melbourne*: Macmillan, 1942. xii + 196 pp. 4/6.

Sheffer, E. J. (ed.). — Aspects de la Guerre moderne. *New York*: Farrar and Rinehart, 1942. viii + 211 pp. \$1.50.

ITALIAN

Cioffari, V and Van Horne, J. (Eds.). — "I Miei Ricordi" di Massimo D'Azeglio. *Boston*: D. C. Heath, 1943. 60 pp.

Kany, C. E. and Speroni, C. — Advanced Italian conversation. *Boston*: D. C. Heath, 1943. 77 pp.

Lansing, Mrs. Elisabeth. — Leonardo, Master of the Renaissance. With illustrations by W. Sharp and an introduction by H. W. van Loon. *New York*: Crowell, 1942. xiii + 237 pp.

Sheedy, Anna T. — Bartolus on Social Conditions in the Fourteenth Century. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press. 267 pp.

SPANISH

Asín Palacios, M.—Contribución a la Toponimia árabe en España. *Madrid*: Estanislao Maestre, 1940. 156 pp.

Bastera, R. de.—Antología poética. Preliminares de José María de Areilza. *Barcelona*: Ed. Nacional, 1939. 120 pp.

Benedicto Santos, G.—Tratado teórico-práctico de Ortografía de la lengua española. *Madrid*: Reus, 1940. 437 pp.

Borja y Aragón, F. de.—Antología lírica, ed. Manuel Cristóbal. *Madrid*: Gráfica Informaciones, 1941. 61 pp.

Casassas Canto, E.—Gramática de la lengua española. *Barcelona*: Edit. Montserrat, 1941. 348 pp.

Cervantes.—Antología. El Historiador y el Político, por E. Aguado Hernández. *Madrid*: Editora Nacional, 1941. 212 pp.

—, El Hombre y el Escritor, por E. Aguado. *Ibid.*, 1941. 216 pp.

—, Riconete y Cortadillo y La ilustre Fregona, ed. A. González Palencia. *Zaragoza*: Edit. Ebro, 1940. 127 pp.

Cruz, Ramón de la.—Sainetes, ed. José M. de Castro y Calvo. *Zaragoza*: Edit. Ebro, 1941. 118 pp.

—, Teoría e historia de los géneros literarios. *Barcelona*: Eds. La Espiga, 1940. 240 pp.

Donoso Cortés, J.—Antología, ed. A. Tovar. *Barcelona*: Edit. Nacional, 1940. 232 pp.

—, Lope de Vega. Símbolo del temperamento estético español. *Murcia*: Univ. de Murcia, 1936. 116 pp.

—, Los Manriques, poetas del siglo XV. *Zaragoza*: Edit. Ebro, 1940. 125 pp.

Encina, Juan del.—Poemas, ed. J. Givernal Mas. *Barcelona*: Edit. Atlántida, 1940. 154 pp.

Espronceda.—Poesía lírica, ed. N. Alonso Cortés. *Zaragoza*: Edit. Ebro, 1941. 126 pp.

Esquerri, Ramón.—Iniciación a la literatura. 3 vols. *Barcelona*: Edit. Apolo, 1938.

Gella Iturriaga, J. (ed.).—Romances viejos. *Zaragoza*: Ebro, 1940. 128 pp.

González Olmedo, F.—Juan Bonifacio (1583-1606) y la cultura literaria del Siglo de Oro. *Santander*: Soc. de Menéndez Pelayo, 1938. 208 pp.

Guiraldos, Francisco.—Acerca de "La Verdad sobre el falso Quijote" de Don Francisco Vindel. *Madrid*: Beltrán, 1940.

Hernández García, E.—Gramática histórica de la lengua española. *Madrid*: Aldecoa, 1938. 370 pp.

Herrero García, M.—San Juan de la Cruz y el Cántico Espiritual. *Madrid*: Ed. Escelicer, 1942. 105 pp.

Jiménez Rueda, J.—Juan Ruiz de Alarcón y su tiempo. *México*: Edit. Porrúa, 1939. 327 pp.

Jovellanos y Ramírez.—Antología, ed. M. Fernández Almagro. *Barcelona*: Edit. Nacional, 1940. 280 pp.

Juan de la Cruz.—Obra poética, ed. M. Manent. *Barcelona*: Montaner y Simón, 1942. xxii + 268 pp.

Juan Manuel.—El Conde Lucanor, ed. A. González Palencia. *Zaragoza*: Herald de Aragón, 1940. 134 pp.

León, Luis de.—Poesía, ed. J. M. Alda Tesan. *Zaragoza*: Edit. Ebro, 1939. 115 pp.

March, Ausias.—Obras, ed. Martín de Riquier. *Barcelona*: Edit. Yunque, 1941. 128 pp.

Menéndez Pidal, R.—Los romances de América. *Buenos Aires*: Fabril y Financiera, 1939. 187 pp.

Montoliu, M. de.—Manual d'Historia crítica de la literatura catalana. *Barcelona*: Edit. Pedagógica, 1938. 447 pp.

Oñate y Pérez, M. del P.—El feminismo en la literatura española. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1938. 256 pp.

Pardo Asso, J.—Nuevo Diccionario etimológico aragonés. *Zaragoza*: Bailly-Baillière, 1938. 399 pp.

Quevedo.—Vida del Buscón, ed. S. Gill Gaya. *Barcelona*: Edit. Ebro, 1941. 133 pp.

Ros, Félix (ed.).—Poesía española. Neoclásicos y románticos. *Barcelona*: Emporium, 1940. 646 pp.

Ruiz, Juan.—Libro de buen amor, ed. J. M. Castro y Calvo. *Zaragoza*: Ebro, 1940. 118 pp.

Santillana, Marqués de.—Páginas escogidas, ed. F. Gutiérrez. *Barcelona*: Miracle, 1939. 286 pp.

—, Poesía, ed. Elena Villamana. *Zaragoza*: Edit. Ebro, 1940. 141 pp.

Torres, F. y Collantes, J.—Antología analítica de textos castellanos. *Cádiz*: Escelicer, 1941. 217 pp.

Ureta, Alberto.—Antología poética, ed. J. Nieto. *Madrid*: Ediciones Patria, 1941. 55 pp.

Valdes, Juan de.—Diálogo de la lengua, ed. R. Lapesa. *Zaragoza*: Ebro, 1940. 136 pp.

Vega, Lope de.—Poesía lírica, ed. J. Manuel Blecua. *Zaragoza*: Ebro, 1939. 126 pp.

PORTUGUESE

Cruz, Daniel da.—Portuguese Lessons for Beginners. *Oxford, O.*: Author, 15 W. Winthrow Ave., 1942. viii + 148 pp. \$1.50.

Kany and Figueiredo.—Intermediate Portuguese Conversation. *Boston*: Heath, 1943. viii + 63 pp. \$0.36.

1943

larcón
1939.

ed. M.
t. Na.

ed. M.
Simón,

ed. A.
do de

Alda
15 pp.
ín de
1941.

es de
nciera,

storia
elona:

nismo
spasa-

o eti-
-Bail-

. Gill
33 pp.
Neo-
orium,

ed. J.
1940.

esco-
iracle,

Zara-

ología
Vadiz:

ed. J.
55 pp.

engua,
36 pp.

ed. J.
1939.

ns for
5 W.
\$1.50.
ediate
Heath,

1943

arcón
1939.

L. M.
Na-

L. M.
món,

L. A.
o de

Alda
5 pp.
a de
1941.

e de
fiera,

loria
oma:

ismo
asa-

eti-
Bail-

Gill
3 pp.
Neo-
ium,

L. J.
1940.

asco-
acle,

oro-

ogía
die:

L. J.
pp.
gua,
pp.
J.
1939.

for
W.
.50.
iate
ath,

ADVENTURES OF A LITERARY HISTORIAN

A collection of his writings presented to H. Carrington Lancaster by his former students and other friends in anticipation of his sixtieth birthday, November 10, 1942.

The volume includes a portrait of Professor Lancaster by Stanislaw Rembski, a foreword by Charles L. Silin of Tulane, an Introduction by Louis Cons of Harvard, and a list of persons and institutions subscribing to the book.

The main portion of the volume is divided into two parts entitled *Open to the Public* and *For Scholars Only*.

The first of these is made up of addresses, anecdotes, material of various kinds in prose and in verse, written for a larger public than that of specialists. Considerably over half of this portion of the book has not been previously published.

For Scholars Only consists of articles that have appeared in American, French, and English scholarly journals. When necessary, these articles are brought up to date. They illustrate the various fields of a literary historian's activities: the discovery and identification of documents, the study of sources and influences, criticism, interpretation, literary biography, etc.

The volume contains xxxi + 392 pages and a frontispiece. Octavo. Cloth. \$5.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE MIND OF A POET

A STUDY OF WORDSWORTH'S THOUGHT
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO

THE PRELUDE

By RAYMOND D. HAVENS

Fifteen years have gone into this search for the hiding places of a poet's power. There are chapters on the part matter-of-factness, passion, fear, wonder, solitude, silence, and loneliness, animism, nature, anti-rationalism, the mystic experience, religion, and imagination played in the thought and poetry of Wordsworth. Other topics are considered more briefly and *The Prelude*, the most illuminating account in English of the mind of a poet, is examined in detail. Theory has not been imposed on poetry but Wordsworth's beliefs have been deduced and explained from what he himself wrote and said.

xviii + 670 pages, two maps, buckram. \$5.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

DENOEU'S

MILITARY FRENCH

For Schools, Colleges, and the Armed Forces
368 pages. \$1.75

A practical manual, comprehensive enough to afford excellent training for prospective interpreters, liaison and intelligence officers. Based on the experience of the author in the French Army during the present war.

Each of forty-two lessons gives (1) brief grammar presentation, (2) word-and-idiom study covering one aspect of the war, (3) a chapter of the narrative that runs throughout the text, written in natural, conversational French, and conveying considerable information on the French Army.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Boston

New York

Chicago

Atlanta

San Francisco

Dallas

London

TEMAS DE REPASO

H. CHONON BERKOWITZ

For Composition and Grammar Review

Concise rules clarified by tables cover all main topics of grammar. A Verb Drill in each lesson stresses common irregular verb forms. Exercises are planned to give quadruple repetition of idioms and useful constructions.

A series of highly entertaining, realistic episodes introduces practical vocabulary in everyday situations: a doctor's visit, a trip to the airport, boating, motoring troubles, swimming, telephoning, eating, and a hundred other everyday experiences.

HOLT

257 FOURTH AVENUE · NEW YORK